



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 2013

No. 79

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of grace and goodness, thank You for giving us another day.

As we come on the heels of a long day considering Homeland Security appropriations, we ask Your blessing of strength and perseverance that each Member may best serve their constituents and our entire Nation.

May it be their purpose to see to the hopes of so many Americans that they authenticate the grandeur and glory of the ideals and principles of our democracy with the work they do.

Grant that the men and women of the people's House find the courage and wisdom to work together to forge solutions to the many needs of our Nation and ease the anxieties of so many.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. WALORSKI led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT BILL

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, last night the House Armed Services Committee approved its version of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014.

Included was a provision I sponsored, along with Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ, to extend whistleblower protections to victims of military sexual abuse. This bipartisan proposal will strengthen whistleblower protection laws and ensure that victims are protected from punishment for reporting sexual assault in the military.

The Pentagon recently reported that an estimated 26,000 servicemembers were sexually assaulted last year with just over 3,000 cases reported. This one statistic alone is chilling, and it's only the tip of the iceberg.

Our military represents the bravest men and women in the Nation, and growing reports of sexual assault and underreporting are sadly tarnishing the reputation of our Armed Forces. This bill gets to the root of the problem by creating a safe reporting environment and demanding accountability from our military leaders.

Passage of this bill will be a step in the right direction to help victims and restore trust in our military.

I am pleased this bipartisan provision is one step closer to becoming law.

ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS

(Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government spends more than \$6.5 billion on energy costs every year to heat, cool, and power roughly 500,000 buildings and facilities.

Currently, the administration is auditing Federal agencies for cost savings and has found billions of dollars that are available in savings.

Here's how they work:

Energy savings performance contracts allow a public-private partnership where the Federal agency contracts with an energy service company to conduct energy audits and design and implement energy-saving improvements. There is no cost to the taxpayer. The payment to the contractor comes from savings that are reaped down the line.

It's a win-win-win for the taxpayer, the economy, and the environment. ESPCs lead to local, nonexportable jobs. In fact, every million dollars of ESPC contracting results in the creation of 10 local jobs. ESPCs have already proven themselves to drastically reduce carbon emissions and water usage at Federal facilities.

This is something we can and should do together: save money, create jobs, and improve the environment.

MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULTS

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States military is the most capable and most professional fighting force in history. But while our military is adept at meeting external threats, it has had a more difficult time combating the epidemic of sexual assault and sexual misconduct in its ranks.

Earlier today, the Armed Services Committee passed this year's defense

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3219

bill. I am proud to have supported provisions that will help us tackle the problem of sexual assault in the military by holding perpetrators accountable, protecting victims, and maintaining good order and discipline. I'm particularly pleased that Representative SPEIER and I were able to add whistleblower protection enhancements.

Our men and women in uniform must be able to depend on one another and trust their command will protect them from sexual predators. These crimes inflict lasting damage on individuals and compromise the effectiveness of our military. I am committed to solving this terrible problem once and for all.

SILAS EDENFIELD

(Mr. BARROW of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Silas Edenfield, a 4-year-old boy from my district in Georgia who passed away on May 25 of cancer, just shy of his fifth birthday on June 4.

During his illness, more than 50,000 people from as far away as Australia paid tribute to Silas on social media, joining in his efforts to raise awareness of his deadly disease.

Silas loved Jesus and sea turtles and never let his illness get him down. At his young age, he inspired everyone he met with his bright smile and positive attitude. As one person said, "He brought our community together."

I extend my heartfelt condolences to Silas' family and the community that supported him. His memory will live on with the people whose lives he touched, including this proud Congressman.

JOBS, A PART OF THE AMERICAN DREAM

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 4.5 million Americans have been without a job for 27 weeks or longer. This number is equal to the entire population of the greater Houston area. This should not happen in America. A job is fundamental. It gives individuals the chance to contribute both to their family and to the economy.

America has always been a land of opportunity, growth, and prosperity. Sadly, Washington's policies over the last 4 years are preventing job creators from growing their businesses and creating job opportunities for these 4.5 million Americans out of work.

The endless regulations, tax increases, and the burdens of complying with ObamaCare have made the Federal Government too big and out of control.

Instead of continuing with its flawed policies that are crippling America's future, I hope the President and his administration will work with the House

Republicans as we continue with our plan for economic growth and jobs, that cuts spending, balances the budget, lowers health care costs, eliminates red tape, takes important steps towards energy independence, and encourages responsible oversight of out-of-control government agencies like the IRS.

Mr. Speaker, America is about the American Dream, not the American scheme.

UNREST AND BRUTALITY IN TURKEY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to condemn the excessive force used by Turkish police on demonstrators in Istanbul.

The past few days, these individuals used their rights to assemble and express their displeasure with their government's policies. They called attention to what they view as increasing government curtailment of their rights, but they were met with aggressive violence.

Perhaps just as shocking, most Turkish news outlets did not even cover these events as they unfolded because they feared that they would anger the government and they would go to jail, and because the government controls large parts of the media in Turkey.

This is not the response of a free and democratic society. We expect more from our allies, and I call on Prime Minister Erdogan to condemn this brutal police action and urge the Turkish authorities to exercise restraint.

I also urge both parties to resolve their differences swiftly and peacefully in a manner that respects the rights of all Turkish citizens.

UNFAIR PRACTICES AT THE IRS

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly clear in the last few weeks that certain IRS employees engaged in unfair practices targeting Americans because of their religious or political beliefs. The scrutiny was improperly frequent and systemic. The questions asked of certain groups were intrusive and inappropriate.

A well-functioning government must ensure that those in positions of influence are committed to serving with impartiality and fairness. Revelations that the IRS targeted groups based on their religious or political affiliation undermine the public trust. I think we can all agree that regardless of one's political views, equal treatment under the law is a fundamental right that cannot and should not be broken.

We were sent to Congress to ensure that these fundamental rights are

upheld. We must continue to work aggressively to root out the causes of this serious breach of trust by the IRS.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material for further consideration on H.R. 2217.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 243 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2217.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 0920

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2217) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 93, line 9.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014".

Mr. CARTER. I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2217) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1004

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 10 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 6, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 6, 2013 at 9:32 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 161.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 243 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2217.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1005

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2217) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the bill had been read through page 93, line 11.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

Amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN
OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 287, noes 136, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

AYES—287

Andrews	Eshoo	LoBiondo
Barber	Esty	Loeback
Barletta	Farenthold	Lofgren
Barr	Farr	Lowenthal
Barrow (GA)	Fattah	Lowe
Bass	Fitzpatrick	Lujan Grisham
Beatty	Flores	(NM)
Benish	Foster	Luján, Ben Ray
Bera (CA)	Frankel (FL)	(NM)
Bishop (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Lummis
Bishop (NY)	Fudge	Lynch
Bishop (UT)	Gabbard	Maffei
Blumenauer	Gallego	Maloney,
Bonamici	Garamendi	Carolyn
Brady (PA)	Garcia	Maloney, Sean
Brady (TX)	Gardner	Marino
Braley (IA)	Gerlach	Markey
Brooks (AL)	Gibbs	Massie
Brown (FL)	Gibson	Matheson
Brownley (CA)	Gohmert	Matsui
Buchanan	Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)
Bucshon	Gosar	McCaul
Bustos	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Butterfield	Grayson	McCollum
Calvert	Green, Gene	McDermott
Camp	Griffin (AR)	McGovern
Capito	Griffith (VA)	McIntyre
Capps	Grijalva	McKeon
Capuano	Gutierrez	McKinley
Cárdenas	Hahn	McMorris
Carney	Hanabusa	Rodgers
Carson (IN)	Hanna	McNerney
Cartwright	Hastings (FL)	Meadows
Castor (FL)	Heck (NV)	Meehan
Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)	Meeks
Chaffetz	Herrera Beutler	Meng
Chu	Higgins	Mica
Cicilline	Himes	Michaud
Clarke	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)
Clay	Holt	Miller, Gary
Cleaver	Honda	Miller, George
Clyburn	Horsford	Moore
Coble	Hoyer	Moran
Coffman	Huffman	Mullin
Cohen	Hultgren	Mulvaney
Collins (NY)	Hunter	Murphy (FL)
Connolly	Hurt	Nadler
Conyers	Israel	Napolitano
Cook	Issa	Neal
Cooper	Jackson Lee	Negrete McLeod
Costa	Jeffries	Noem
Courtney	Johnson (OH)	Nolan
Cramer	Johnson, E. B.	Nugent
Crowley	Jones	O'Rourke
Cuellar	Jordan	Owens
Cummings	Kaptur	Pallone
Daines	Keating	Pascarella
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Pastor (AZ)
Davis, Danny	Kennedy	Payne
DeFazio	Kildee	Pearce
DeGette	Kilmer	Pelosi
Delaney	Kind	Perlmutter
DeLauro	King (NY)	Peters (CA)
DelBene	Kirkpatrick	Peters (MI)
Denham	Kuster	Peterson
Deutsch	LaMalfa	Petri
Dingell	Lamborn	Pingree (ME)
Doggett	Lance	Pocan
Doyle	Langevin	Poe (TX)
Duckworth	Larsen (WA)	Polis
Duncan (SC)	Larson (CT)	Price (NC)
Edwards	Lee (CA)	Quigley
Ellison	Levin	Rahall
Engel	Lewis	Rangel
Enyart	Lipinski	Reichert

Renacci	Schrader	Titus
Richmond	Schwartz	Tonko
Roe (TN)	Schweikert	Tsongas
Rogers (MI)	Scott (VA)	Upton
Rooney	Scott, David	Van Hollen
Ros-Lehtinen	Sensenbrenner	Vargas
Roybal-Allard	Serrano	Veasey
Royce	Sewell (AL)	Vela
Ruiz	Shea-Porter	Velázquez
Runyan	Sherman	Vislosky
Ruppersberger	Sinema	Walz
Rush	Sires	Wasserman
Ryan (OH)	Slaughter	Schultz
Salmon	Smith (NJ)	Waters
Sánchez, Linda	Smith (WA)	Watt
T.	Southerland	Waxman
Sanchez, Loretta	Speier	Welch
Sarbanes	Stewart	Westmoreland
Scalise	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Schakowsky	Takano	Woodall
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Schneider	Tierney	Young (FL)
Schock	Tipton	

NOES—136

Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Ribble
Alexander	Grimm	Rice (SC)
Amash	Guthrie	Rigell
Amodei	Hall	Roby
Bachmann	Harper	Rogers (KY)
Bachus	Harris	Rohrabacher
Barton	Hartzler	Rokita
Bentivolio	Hastings (WA)	Roskam
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Ross
Black	Holding	Rothfus
Blackburn	Hudson	Ryan (WI)
Bonner	Huelskamp	Sanford
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Scott, Austin
Bridenstine	Jenkins	Sessions
Brooks (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Shimkus
Broun (GA)	Joyce	Shuster
Burgess	Kelly (PA)	Simpson
Cantor	King (IA)	Smith (MO)
Carter	Kingston	Smith (NE)
Cassidy	Kinzinger (IL)	Smith (TX)
Chabot	Kline	Stivers
Cole	Labrador	Stockman
Collins (GA)	Lankford	Stutzman
Conaway	Latham	Terry
Cotton	Latta	Thompson (PA)
Crawford	Long	Thornberry
Crenshaw	Lucas	Tiberi
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Valadao
Dent	McHenry	Wagner
DeSantis	Messer	Walberg
DesJarlais	Miller (FL)	Walden
Duffy	Murphy (PA)	Walorski
Duncan (TN)	Neugebauer	Weber (TX)
Ellmers	Nunes	Webster (FL)
Fincher	Nunnelee	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	Olson	Williams
Fleming	Palazzo	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Paulsen	Wittman
Fortenberry	Perry	Wolf
Fox	Pitts	Womack
Franks (AZ)	Pompeo	Yoder
Garrett	Posey	Yoho
Gingrey (GA)	Price (GA)	Young (IN)
Gowdy	Radel	
Granger	Reed	

NOT VOTING—11

Becerra	Johnson (GA)	Thompson (CA)
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Whitfield
Diaz-Balart	Pittenger	Young (AK)
Green, Al	Rogers (AL)	

□ 1033

Messrs. MCKEON, RANGEL, FARENTHOLD, GRIFFIN of Arkansas, NUGENT, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Messrs. GARDNER, RICHMOND, BUCSHON, GIBBS, MCKINLEY, BARLETTA, COFFMAN, LOBIONDO, ROONEY, HULTGREN, RUSH, SOUTHERLAND, BISHOP of Utah, DUNCAN of South Carolina, SCHOCK, STEWART, MCCARTHY of California, DENHAM, KING of New York, and GRAVES of Georgia changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed the following votes.

1. Lujan Amendment to H.R. 2217—Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on this bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 224, noes 201, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

AYES—224

Aderholt	Fleming	Latta
Alexander	Flores	LoBiondo
Amash	Forbes	Long
Amodei	Fortenberry	Lucas
Bachmann	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Barletta	Franks (AZ)	Lummis
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Marchant
Barrow (GA)	Gardner	Marino
Barton	Garrett	Massie
Benishek	Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)
Bentivolio	Gibbs	McCaul
Bilirakis	Gibson	McClintock
Bishop (UT)	Gingrey (GA)	McHenry
Black	Gohmert	McIntyre
Blackburn	Goodlatte	McKeon
Bonner	Gosar	McKinley
Boustany	Gowdy	McMorris
Brady (TX)	Granger	Rodgers
Bridenstine	Graves (GA)	Meadows
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	Meehan
Brooks (IN)	Griffin (AR)	Messer
Broun (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Mica
Buchanan	Guthrie	Miller (FL)
Bucshon	Hall	Miller (MI)
Burgess	Hanna	Miller, Gary
Calvert	Harper	Mullin
Camp	Harris	Mulvaney
Cantor	Hartzler	Murphy (PA)
Capito	Hastings (WA)	Neugebauer
Carter	Heck (NV)	Noem
Cassidy	Hensarling	Nugent
Chabot	Herrera Beutler	Nunnelee
Chaffetz	Holding	Olson
Coble	Hudson	Palazzo
Coffman	Huelskamp	Paulsen
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Pearce
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Perry
Collins (NY)	Hunter	Petri
Conaway	Hurt	Pitts
Cook	Issa	Poe (TX)
Cotton	Jenkins	Pompeo
Cramer	Johnson (OH)	Posey
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)
Crenshaw	Jones	Radel
Culberson	Jordan	Rahall
Daines	Joyce	Reed
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Reichert
Dent	King (IA)	Renacci
DeSantis	King (NY)	Ribble
DesJarlais	Kingston	Rice (SC)
Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell
Duncan (SC)	Kline	Roby
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Roe (TN)
Ellmers	LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)
Farenthold	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)
Fincher	Lance	Rogers (MI)
Fitzpatrick	Lankford	Rohrabacher
Fleischmann	Latham	Rokita

Rooney	Smith (MO)	Walberg
Roskam	Smith (NE)	Walden
Ross	Smith (NJ)	Walorski
Rothfus	Smith (TX)	Weber (TX)
Royce	Southerland	Webster (FL)
Runyan	Stewart	Wenstrup
Ryan (WI)	Stivers	Westmoreland
Salmon	Stockman	Williams
Sanford	Stutzman	Wilson (SC)
Scalise	Terry	Wittman
Schock	Thompson (PA)	Wolf
Schweikert	Thornberry	Womack
Scott, Austin	Tiberi	Woodall
Sensenbrenner	Tipton	Yoder
Shimkus	Turner	Yoho
Shuster	Upton	Young (FL)
Simpson	Wagner	Young (IN)

NOES—201

Andrews	Green, Gene	Nunes
Bachus	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Barber	Grimm	Owens
Bass	Gutierrez	Pallone
Beatty	Hahn	Pascarell
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Higgins	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Himes	Peters (CA)
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Braley (IA)	Holt	Peterson
Brown (FL)	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Pocan
Bustos	Hoyer	Polis
Butterfield	Huffman	Price (NC)
Capps	Israel	Quigley
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Richmond
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Chu	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clarke	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kind	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kuster	Schiff
Cohen	Langevin	Schneider
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Schwartz
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Levin	Scott, David
Courtney	Lewis	Serrano
Crowley	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Lofgren	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Sinema
Davis, Danny	Lowe	Sires
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Slaughter
DeGette	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Smith (WA)
Delaney	DelLauro	Speier
DeLauro	DelBene	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Denham	Takano
Denham	Deutsch	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Dingell	Tierney
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Doyle	Markey	Tonko
Duckworth	Matheson	Tsongas
Edwards	Matsui	Valadao
Ellison	McCollum	Van Hollen
Engel	McDermott	Vargas
Enyart	McGovern	Veasey
Eshoo	McNerney	Vela
Esty	Meeks	Velázquez
Farr	Meng	Visclosky
Fattah	Michaud	Walz
Foster	Miller, George	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Schultz
Fudge	Moran	Waters
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Watt
Galleo	Nadler	Waxman
Garamendi	Napolitano	Welch
Garcia	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Negrete McLeod	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Nolan	

NOT VOTING—9

Becerra	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Campbell	Pittenger	Whitfield
Diaz-Balart	Sessions	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1041

Mr. LIPINSKI changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. WEBER of Texas changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 225, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

AYES—196

Aderholt	Gibbs	Mica
Alexander	Gibson	Miller (FL)
Amash	Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)
Amodei	Gohmert	Mullin
Bachmann	Goodlatte	Mulvaney
Bachus	Gosar	Murphy (PA)
Barr	Gowdy	Negrete McLeod
Barton	Granger	Neugebauer
Benishek	Graves (GA)	Noem
Bentivolio	Graves (MO)	Nolan
Bilirakis	Griffin (AR)	Nugent
Bishop (UT)	Griffith (VA)	Nunes
Black	Guthrie	Nunnelee
Blackburn	Harper	Olson
Bonner	Harris	Palazzo
Boustany	Hartzler	Paulsen
Bridenstine	Hastings (WA)	Pearce
Brooks (AL)	Heck (NV)	Perry
Brooks (IN)	Hensarling	Petri
Broun (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Pitts
Buchanan	Holding	Poe (TX)
Bucshon	Hudson	Polis
Burgess	Huelskamp	Pompeo
Camp	Huizenga (MI)	Posey
Cantor	Hultgren	Price (GA)
Capito	Hunter	Radel
Cassidy	Hurt	Rahall
Coble	Issa	Reichert
Coffman	Jenkins	Ribble
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Collins (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Rigell
Conaway	Jones	Roby
Cook	Jordan	Roe (TN)
Cotton	King (IA)	Rogers (MI)
Cramer	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita
Crenshaw	Kline	Rooney
Daines	Labrador	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Ross
DeSantis	Lamborn	Rothfus
DesJarlais	Lance	Royce
Duffy	Lankford	Ryan (WI)
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Salmon
Duncan (TN)	Lofgren	Sanford
Ellmers	Long	Scalise
Farenthold	Lucas	Schock
Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Schrader
Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Schweikert
Fleischmann	Massie	Scott, Austin
	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
	McCaul	Shimkus
	McClintock	Shuster
	McHenry	Smith (MO)
	McKinley	Smith (NE)
	McMorris	Southerland
	Rodgers	Stewart
	Meadows	Stivers
	Messer	

Stockman	Walden	Wittman
Stutzman	Walorski	Wolf
Terry	Weber (TX)	Womack
Tiberi	Webster (FL)	Woodall
Tipton	Wenstrup	Yoder
Upton	Westmoreland	Yoho
Wagner	Williams	Young (IN)
Walberg	Wilson (SC)	

NOES—225

Andrews	Green, Al	Neal
Barber	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Barletta	Grijalva	Owens
Barrow (GA)	Grimm	Pallone
Bass	Hahn	Pascarella
Beatty	Hall	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hanna	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Higgins	Peters (MI)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Peterson
Brady (TX)	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)
Braley (IA)	Holt	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Honda	Price (NC)
Bustos	Horsford	Quigley
Butterfield	Hoyer	Rangel
Calvert	Huffman	Reed
Capps	Israel	Renacci
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rogers (KY)
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Roskam
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Carter	Joyce	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kaptur	Runyan
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (OH)
Chaffetz	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Kildee	T.
Cicilline	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kind	Sarbanes
Clay	King (NY)	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Clyburn	Kuster	Schneider
Cohen	Langevin	Schwartz
Cole	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Conyers	Latham	Serrano
Cook	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Levin	Shea-Porter
Costa	Lewis	Sherman
Courtney	Lipinski	Simpson
Crowley	LoBiondo	Sinema
Cuellar	Loebach	Sires
Cummings	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	(NM)	Speier
DeGette	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	(NM)	Takano
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DeBene	Maffei	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Maloney,	Thornberry
Dent	Carolyn	Tierney
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Dingell	Marino	Tonko
Doggett	Markey	Tsongas
Doyle	Matheson	Turner
Duckworth	Matsui	Valadao
Edwards	McCollum	Van Hollen
Ellison	McDermott	Vargas
Engel	McGovern	Veasey
Enyart	McIntyre	Vela
Eshoo	McKeon	Velázquez
Farr	McNerney	Visclosky
Fattah	Meehan	Walz
Foster	Meeks	Wasserman
Foxx	Meng	Schultz
Frankel (FL)	Michaud	Waters
Fudge	Miller, Gary	Watt
Gabbard	Miller, George	Waxman
Gallego	Moore	Welch
Garamendi	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Garcia	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Gerlach	Nadler	Young (FL)
Grayson	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra	Marchant	Thompson (CA)
Brownley (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	Whitfield
Campbell	Pittenger	Young (AK)
Diaz-Balart	Rogers (AL)	
Gutierrez	Smith (TX)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1045

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CARTER Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2217) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 243, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1050

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Murphy of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2217 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 2, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

Page 3, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,000,000)".

Page 37, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,500,000)".

Page 39, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,500,000)".

Page 39, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,500,000)".

Page 49, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

Mr. MURPHY of Florida (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to suspend the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will be amended and immediately proceed to final passage.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member PRICE for working together in a truly bipartisan manner on the underlying legislation. With this bill, we have shown that we can put partisanship aside and do what's right for the American people—providing the necessary funding to the Department of Homeland Security to keep our Nation safe from attacks as well as responding to national disasters. But just as we have the responsibility to support the important work that Homeland Security does, we also have the responsibility to make sure we are spending smartly by allocating funds where they are most needed.

After witnessing the tragedies caused by the recent tornado in Moore, Oklahoma, wildfires in California and New Mexico, and the Northeast still recovering from Superstorm Sandy, we are reminded that disasters can strike in any community. Having lived in Florida my entire life, I have experienced firsthand the impact these disasters can have, especially when local and State governments are not on the same page as the Federal Government in adequately preparing for and responding to extreme weather.

As we debate today, Florida and the eastern coast is preparing to deal with the potentially devastating effects of Tropical Storm Andrea. With the start of what is predicted to be an active tornado and hurricane season, it is especially important for Congress to act. That is why this week I announced the formation of a bipartisan Disaster Relief Caucus to work toward improving the effectiveness of disaster preparedness and response efforts. It is vital that we work to make disaster preparedness efforts more efficient across all levels of government.

My amendment would take \$2.5 million from the Department's administrative operating expenses to put towards the Pre-Disaster Mitigation program. This important program will assist State and local governments in better preparing for natural disasters, saving American lives and communities. Furthermore, better preparedness efforts reduce the costs of disaster response and cleanup efforts, ultimately saving American taxpayer dollars.

Additionally, with less than 2 months having passed since the tragedy of the bombings at the Boston Marathon, we must also recommit ourselves to funding antiterrorism efforts. My amendment would provide a 5 percent increase in funding to train emergency responders on the Federal, State, and

local level so they can be better prepared to prevent and respond to domestic attacks. Again, this funding is actually fully offset from the Department's administrative operating expenses.

My amendment should have the full support of the House, and I once again want to point out that it will not kill the underlying legislation. It would simply shift spending from administrative operations to invest in natural disaster preparedness and antiterrorism efforts. As we continue to tighten our belts in Washington, I think we can all agree that these programs are a more vital use of resources than administrative expenses.

Natural disasters impact all Americans, as do acts of terrorism. These are two areas that should never get caught up in partisan bickering. We must stand united to prevent future tragedies caused by both natural disasters and acts of terrorism, which know no party affiliation. Anyone who supports the underlying legislation has no reason not to also support this amendment to spend smarter to better protect our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment is an opportunity to show the American people that Congress is willing to work together to put the safety and well-being of the American people first. I hope to see the same bipartisan support for my amendment as we have seen for the underlying legislation. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It's a strong bill. This bill focuses on securing the homeland, protecting our citizens against terrorist acts like the one that we experienced in Boston, and we've talked about it for the last 3 days.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is unnecessary. This bill specifically addresses the events in Boston by the following:

Adding an additional 1,600 CBP officers, increasing the funding for watch-listing for the 3rd year in a row, increasing visa enforcement; increasing first responder grants by \$400 million for a total of \$2.5 billion—more than adequate funding to help equip and train first responders, and doubling the amount for bomb prevention. And the bill already has more than \$30 million in pre-disaster mitigation grants.

This bill was constructed in a bipartisan fashion, garnering unanimous support at the subcommittee and full committee levels, and has earned praise from both sides of the aisle and here on the House floor.

This bill is not contentious. It fulfills one of the most basic duties of the Members of Congress: keeping our Nation safe.

Let's not focus on politics today. Let's focus on constitutional responsi-

bility to provide for the safety for all who live in our wonderful country.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to apply the lessons learned from recent terrorist attacks, reject this flawed motion, and vote on this important bill. Vote "yes" on the important bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 226, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

AYES—196

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah

Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean

Matheson
Matsui
McCullum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrad
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman

Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney

Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—226

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodel
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen

Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Southernland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Webstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Becerra
Braley (IA)
Campbell
Cantor

Larsen (WA)
Markey
McCarthy (NY)
Pittenger

Smith (TX)
Stivers
Thompson (CA)
Whitfield

□ 1102

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 210, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 182, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

YEAS—245

Aderholt	Gohmert	Murphy (PA)
Alexander	Goodlatte	Neugebauer
Amodei	Gosar	Noem
Bachmann	Gowdy	Nugent
Bachus	Granger	Nunes
Barber	Graves (GA)	Nunnelee
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Olson
Barr	Griffin (AR)	Owens
Barrow (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Palazzo
Barton	Grimm	Paulsen
Benishek	Guthrie	Pearce
Bera (CA)	Hall	Perry
Billrakis	Hanna	Peters (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Pitts
Black	Harris	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Hartzer	Pompeo
Bonner	Hastings (WA)	Posey
Boustany	Heck (NV)	Price (GA)
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Quigley
Braley (IA)	Herrera Beutler	Radel
Bridenstine	Holding	Rahall
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Reed
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Reichert
Brown (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Buchanan	Hultgren	Ribble
Buchshon	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Burgess	Hurt	Richmond
Bustos	Issa	Rigell
Calvert	Jenkins	Roby
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Capito	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Carter	Joyce	Rogers (MI)
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher
Chabot	King (IA)	Rokita
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Rooney
Coble	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Roskam
Cole	Kirkpatrick	Ross
Collins (GA)	Kline	Rothfus
Collins (NY)	Kuster	Royce
Conaway	Labrador	Ruiz
Cook	LaMalfa	Runyan
Cotton	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Cramer	Lance	Salmon
Crawford	Lankford	Scalise
Crenshaw	Latham	Schneider
Culberson	Latta	Schock
Daines	Lipinski	Schweikert
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Scott, Austin
Denham	Loeback	Sessions
Dent	Long	Shimkus
DeSantis	Lucas	Shuster
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	Maloney, Sean	Sinema
Duckworth	Marchant	Smith (MO)
Duffy	Marino	Smith (NE)
Duncan (SC)	Markey	Smith (NJ)
Ellmers	Matheson	Smith (TX)
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Southerland
Fincher	McCaull	Stewart
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Stivers
Fleischmann	McHenry	Stutzman
Fleming	McIntyre	Terry
Flores	McKeon	Thompson (PA)
Forbes	McKinley	Thornberry
Fortenberry	McMorris	Tiberti
Fox	Rodgers	Tipton
Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Turner
Frelinghuysen	Meehan	Upton
Gallagher	Messer	Valadao
Garcia	Mica	Wagner
Gardner	Miller (FL)	Walberg
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Walden
Gerlach	Miller, Gary	Walorski
Gibbs	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Gibson	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (FL)	Wenstrup

Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—182

Amash
Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Bentivolio
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene

NOT VOTING—7

Becerra
Campbell
Conyers
McCarthy (NY)
Pittenger
Thompson (CA)

□ 1112

Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Ms. SHEA-PORTER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. NEUGEBAUER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for rollcall vote 211, as I had stepped away from the House Floor momentarily. If I had been present for this vote, on final passage of H.R. 2217, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2014, I would have voted "nay."

Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 211, I inadvertently voted "aye" when I intended to vote "no" on final passage of H.R. 2217, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

The addition of the Amendment to H.R. 2217 offered by Mr. KING altered the true intent of the bill. Mr. KING's Amendment would prohibit the use of prosecutorial discretion by Immigration and Customs Enforcement, preventing Immigration and Customs Enforcement from focusing its limited enforcement resources on those who pose a real threat to public safety and national security.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes 207, 208, 209, 210 and 211. If present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 207, "no" on rollcall 208, "no" on rollcall 209, "yea" on rollcall 210, and "no" on rollcall 211.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1249

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1249.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADEL). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to my friend for next week's schedule, I would like to join, I know, with all of our colleagues in wishing him a happy birthday. It is the majority leader's birthday today, and because I don't want him to retaliate, I'm not going to mention which birthday it is, but I want to congratulate him and wish him the very best. We'll have a birthday colloquy today.

I thank him for his leadership, and I yield to him to explain our schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my friend from Maryland, for those kind birthday wishes.

Yes, it is my 50th birthday. I've been saying all day that my wife, Diana, and I are empty nesters now, so it's about time I'm 50. But I do thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman that I'll be glad to take him up on a kinder and gentler colloquy for the birthday.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet in pro forma session at 3 p.m., and no votes are expected. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and at noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

□ 1120

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. In addition, the House will consider H.R. 1910, the National Defense Authorization Act. Chairman BUCK McKEON and his committee once again will bring a bipartisan bill to the floor to ensure that our men and women in the armed services have the tools and resources necessary to protect the freedoms that all of us enjoy here at home.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

We have started the appropriations process. We did two bills this week. They were relatively bipartisan in nature.

I regret, of course, the adoption of the King amendment, which we thought was a very bad policy. It precluded us from voting for a bill that we otherwise would have voted for and that we failed to reach bipartisan agreement. I think there were some on your side who did not want the King amendment offered which precludes any discretion for prosecutors, which I think is bad as general policy and certainly bad as it relates to the DREAM-ers.

I would hope that as we move forward on the appropriation bills, that we would be able to do those as we did the Military Construction, Veteran Affairs, and Related Agencies bill on which we passed on an almost overwhelming vote on both sides of the aisle.

One of the problems, Mr. Leader, is going to be the amount of dollars that have been made available to the nine remaining bills—perhaps Agriculture—so the eight remaining bills after we do MilCon and Homeland Security, which essentially were done at the agreed-upon levels of the Budget Control Act, similar to what the Senate is marking their bills to. I'm not sure what the defense number is going to be, but our fear and concern is that these bills will be marked so that substantial dollars that would otherwise have been available to other subcommittees will not be available because, in effect, we front-loaded spending on the first three bills.

The Ryan budget, as the gentleman knows, is almost \$100 billion less than the agreement of August 2011 on how much dollars would be available for priorities on the discretionary side of our budget.

Can the gentleman give me any information with reference to whether or not we may still be going to a budget conference where we perhaps could reach elimination of the sequester and a new number that could be agreed upon between the Senate and the House, as we always have to do? Whether there's a budget or not, we have to agree on the numbers. We are

about \$100 billion apart, and that has to be overcome if we're going to pass bills.

Can the gentleman give me any thoughts on whether or not we're going to go to conference? There is nothing on the schedule for a motion to go to conference or appointment of conferees.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I understand his concerns.

I think all of us have concerns about the way spending reductions are implemented under sequester. As the gentleman knows, we in the majority have continued to try and advocate. We've put proposals forward to accomplish the spending reductions and reforms in a smarter way. I think both of us, Mr. Speaker, would agree there are much smarter ways for that to happen.

Unfortunately, it is the law. In fact, again, the House has posited its formula for better reductions in spending. The White House and Senate refused to go along. So sequester is the law. As the gentleman knows, 302(b)s are set according to the post-sequester numbers, and that is our intention, Mr. Speaker, to abide by the law with the sequester in place.

I would respond to the gentleman's inquiry about budget conference, and the gentleman knows, as I've said before, Chairman RYAN stands ready to work with Senator MURRAY on drawing an outline and structure for the way a conference would proceed. Unfortunately, there can be even no discussion on that point because there is an insistence on the part of the Senate and the White House that any budget conference discussion include a discussion of tax increases. We have said repeatedly that we can't be raising taxes every other month, every 6 months in this town. There was a significant increase in taxes, an impact on working Americans this year because of the fiscal cliff. We remain committed to addressing the problems of the budget, but will not do so while there is an insistence that a prerequisite is raising taxes.

Mr. HOYER. In other words, I think the gentleman is saying there is not going to be a conference because there is disagreement on what the result of that conference will be? Is that what I'm hearing you say?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I will respond to the gentleman that we would like to have agreement that we can begin discussions of a fiscally sane path to balancing our budget.

As the gentleman knows, Mr. Speaker, our conference has made its stand saying we want to balance the budget, we want to promote spending reductions and reforms that get us there in 10 years. In that vein, we would like to see that it's not punishing the American taxpayer the way that we get there, as far as the budgeteers are concerned here in Washington, that it's

from growing our economy and from reforming the kinds of things that are necessary to take care of those unfunded liabilities at the Federal level.

Mr. HOYER. I would say that we have indicated on a number of occasions that we would love to see some growing-the-economy legislation on the floor, jobs bills on the floor, bills that the administration and Republicans and economists on both sides say would grow the economy. We haven't seen those, and we're concerned about that.

First of all, let me make the observation that we don't believe the first three bills that you're bringing out—you've brought out two defense bills—are being brought out at the Ryan-budget levels. In fact, they're being brought out substantially above the Ryan-budget levels, if, in fact, you perceived equal distribution under 302(b) of the allocations of discretionary money.

We don't share your view that the two bills we voted on—the two bills we voted on, frankly, have been at the Senate level, essentially, which is why they were relatively bipartisan. Not only was it at the Senate level, but it was at the level we agreed to in 2011, and August of 2011 would, in fact, be the discretionary number for fiscal year 2014.

There's not anything on the schedule with reference to the debt limit. As the gentleman knows, the debt limit was extended until May 19. That is now 3 weeks past, and we have not dealt with the debt limit.

Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any plan to deal with the debt limit extension, which the gentleman and I agree must be done if we're not going to destabilize the economy and grow the economy?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

To his first point about jobs bills, Mr. Speaker, we have remained committed in the House, as the majority, to doing all we can to help every American in terms of a brighter future, and that is a path to a better job, better career.

We brought forward the SKILLS Act, something that is a bipartisan commitment and should have been a lot more so on this floor in trying to streamline workforce training programs to help those who are unemployed.

We want to help the unemployed get into a job. The Federal workforce training program is a mess. There are 50 programs. It is very difficult for unemployed people to get the training and skills they need to get a job. Unfortunately, that wasn't met with a lot of bipartisan reception.

Secondly, we just voted on the Keystone XL pipeline bill, a known proposal to create tens of thousands of jobs, much less contribute to America's energy security and independence, as well as competitiveness, which means more jobs and more capital flowing into America.

We also passed, without any bipartisan support, the Working Families Flexibility Act, looking to those struggling moms and dads who are working, the fact that 50 percent of our workforce comes from dual-income households, many of them with kids.

□ 1130

The Working Families Flexibility Act, it addressed the very struggles that working families have in trying to make their life work. We couldn't get bipartisan support on that. And then I would say to the gentleman, we remain committed to making the future brighter through offering more opportunity to all people.

Our solutions, that come from conservatives in the House majority, we believe our solutions can work for everyone. The gentleman knows—he and I have met on his Make It In America agenda—there are things that we have in common, but, unfortunately, we can't see a way to having bipartisan votes. So I remain committed to working with the gentleman on his agenda, and I know the spirit in which he approaches his obligations to his constituents and his caucus, and know that we hopefully can get back on track towards that end.

Now, towards the question, secondly, about budget levels and writing the bills, I would say to the gentleman that we have drafted the appropriations bills, marked them up, along with his caucus, and I would say that they reflect our priorities. Obviously, our priorities are going to differ from the Members on his side. The trick is to try and see where we can work towards a commonality.

And lastly, to the debt limit, yes, we remain very concerned about that. Hopefully, we can all work together and come up with a way that we can adopt a plan that will manage down the debt and deficit and allow us to reach a balance in the Federal level within 10 years, enacting the necessary reforms to the programs that we know are disproportionately causing the deficit without disproportionately continuing to hit the discretionary side, when we know the mandatory side provides most of the impetus for growth.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would say that he mentioned two bills with reference to jobs—the SKILLS Act. Unfortunately, the SKILLS Act suffered from the same thing that the Homeland Security Act just today suffered from, as the gentleman knows. Contrary to what we could have done on a bipartisan basis in the SKILLS Act, diversity, a small number was inserted into that bill, reducing diversity visas to this country, which was highly offensive to many, many Americans who saw that as a direct attack on their ability to get family members to come to this country, particularly from Africa and the Caribbean. It was well known on your side that if that was put in, it was going to

undermine our ability to have a bipartisan agreement.

The same thing occurred with Homeland Security. The gentleman knew full well that the inclusion of the King amendment, which we felt was a very negative amendment and put Dreamers in particular at risk, but whether or not that was the case, it undermines very, very substantially—excuse me, I was incorrect. Staff corrects me, it was the STEM bill that I was talking about. You did not mention that bill. But the point is the same: in moving ahead on a bipartisan fashion, the committee did come out with a bipartisan bill on Homeland Security, you're absolutely correct. And Mr. PRICE, the ranking member, was prepared to vote for that. He was going to urge the caucus to vote for it, and we were going to vote for it until, with very few exceptions, your caucus, your side of the aisle, voted overwhelmingly to put in a piece, an amendment, which you knew would undermine the bipartisanship that had been arrived at by the committee. That's unfortunate.

The gentleman, ironically from our perspective, I tell my friend with great respect, we think that the Family Flexibility Act was the Family Income Reduction Act. We think what it said to an awful lot of working people: you're not going to get paid overtime. If your colleague will work for free and get comp time at some point in time that the employer decides, we're not going to pay overtime. So you're right, we respectfully disagree. As I said, we think that was the Family Income Reduction Act. Families are already struggling. Middle-income families' income has been stuck in the mud, and we think that exacerbated it further. And, very frankly, as the gentleman knows, that was a bill that was offered some years ago with very substantial opposition and didn't become law, as this one is not going to become law.

But in any event, let me close with this question. There are three bills which are being marked up. Maybe Ag was marked up or is going to be marked up soon. Does the gentleman expect that all 12 appropriations bills will be brought to the floor? He talks about priorities. Our priorities are different, although ironically, the gentleman has expressed in his memos and in his agenda that he has announced a desire to focus research on biomedical research to keep Americans healthier, children and others. Ironically, the 302(b) that he talked about earlier suggests, to be exact, a 26.5 percent cut in the bill that funds NIH. That's going to result in a very substantial reduction in basic biomedical research at NIH, and the leaders at NIH have made that very clear that not only that bill but the present sequester is undermining their ability to conduct biomedical research. I know the gentleman feels strongly about that, as I do. Let me ask him: Do you think that bill will be brought to the floor? It was not brought even to the full committee last

year, much less to the floor. Therefore, no one had the opportunity to have a vote on those priorities. Can the gentleman tell me whether he thinks those nine remaining bills will be brought to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is our intent to continue to work through the appropriations process and bring all the bills to the floor, that's correct.

I would say furthermore to the gentleman, as far as the impact of the sequester and 302(b)s on a specific bill versus a piece of that bill, meaning the NIH research piece, as the gentleman knows, legislating, especially in times of fiscal stress, is about prioritizing.

The gentleman correctly states that I'm very much in favor of making a priority out of Federal research and development. I'm convinced that basic research is needed to allow us to continue to advance the breakthroughs in science that not only help heal people and cure disease, but ultimately can help us bring down health care costs, which is the number one issue that's aggravating our deficit.

So I'm glad to hear the gentleman shares that priority. I know he does. But it doesn't mean necessarily that because we are going to commit ourselves to balancing this budget that we cannot share that priority. I hope the gentleman can share with us the import of that priority and support what it is that we're trying to do in the area of research, making sure that we can reduce other lesser priorities in spending.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I look forward to seeing the Labor-Health bill on the floor and seeing how he comes to those priorities because I think it is very important.

Before I close—and I think he has left the floor—but I do want to mention that today is the day on which JOHN DINGELL of Michigan becomes the longest-serving Member of Congress in the history of the Congress, since 1789. He is one of the great legislators with whom many of us have served, and I know that next week we will be having an opportunity on the floor to have all Members, or many Members, participate in recognizing his service.

My staff tells me maybe we're going to do it tomorrow and not next week, but most Members will be here next week, and I expect that they'll be saying something at that time as well.

□ 1140

I know the majority leader joins me in congratulating our colleague and our friend, JOHN DINGELL, on his extraordinary service to not only the Congress of the United States, but to the American people.

Mr. CANTOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. I would just join the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, in congratulating Mr. DINGELL for an incredible,

first of all, milestone, and know he will continue in that service to the people of the great State of Michigan.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 10, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. on Monday, June 10, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 43

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 43. My name was incorrectly added to the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

THE FARM BILL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a bill that's going to be on the House floor here in a couple of weeks. It should be certainly of interest to every man, woman, and child in this country because we all shake hands with a farmer at least three times a day—breakfast, lunch, and dinner.

And also it's relevant to my home State, the Keystone State of Pennsylvania, as agriculture is the number one industry in Pennsylvania. Some folks would be surprised to hear that.

But the fact is we'll have the farm bill before us. I'm proud to be a member of the Agriculture Committee. We have worked long and hard on this farm bill. We've made some great improvements.

We've eliminated many of the subsidies that have kind of clouded the farm bill, in my opinion, for decades; and we've moved towards a more free-market, risk-management approach, protecting our farmers, providing them some access to crop insurance and a dairy margin insurance to protect against the weather.

Agriculture is probably one of the most vulnerable parts, vulnerable industries, when it comes to all extremes of weather.

The farm bill also, I'm proud to say, ensures that every man, woman, and child in this country will have access to nutrition, every income-eligible man, woman, and child, because it also, the House version, ensures some reforms to stop the fraud and abuse that has run rampant with the farm bill.

So I encourage my colleagues to support the farm bill when it comes to the floor in the weeks ahead.

EQUAL PAY ACT ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to join many of my colleagues who came to the floor yesterday to recognize that this coming Monday, June 10, is the 50th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act being signed into law.

With that said, even after 50 years, we're still waging the same battle for women. The historic anniversary is a reminder that there's much work to be done to close the wage gap.

Equal pay for equal work is about fairness for women and families and dollars and common sense. For working mothers who have to put food on the table, and the retired women whose income is tied to their former salary, the wage gap means real dollars.

In south Florida, if the wage gap were eliminated, a working woman would have enough money for 51 more weeks of food, 3 months of mortgage and utility payments, or 5 months of rent, or more than 1,600 additional gallons of gas.

Mr. Speaker, whether you serve customers in a local retail store, or argue cases before the highest court, you have a right to be treated with fairness and dignity.

THEY WERE SOLDIERS ONCE— JUNE 6, 1944

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the seas were high and seasickness was rampant. The sky was gloomy and dark, and the rain was blindingly hard. The sun was hidden from the beaches below as 63,000 GIs, with thousands of our allies, stormed landing sites called Utah, Omaha, Gold, and Juno.

The average age of the American soldier was 20; 2,500 of them died on the first day. It was June 6, 1944. It was D-day in World War II. It was a noble cause: free Europe from the Nazis.

But today, the bootprints, the red crimson beaches of blood of the U.S. soldier are gone. The sea is calm, peaceful, as if it never happened.

But at the top of the cliffs of Normandy, France, 9,387 white glistening crosses and Stars of David of the American fallen shine as an eternal memory that here on this spot the Americans fought and gave all.

They came. They died. They liberated. We remember they were soldiers once, for the worst casualty of war is to be forgotten.

And that's just the way it is.

SUPPORTING YOUNG DREAMERS

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of young DREAMers: young people brought as children without proper documentation to this country; young people willing to work hard to share in the American Dream; young people who have so much to offer America.

Today, 220 House Republicans said "no" to their dream by voting to terminate the program that allows them to stay legally. These Republicans, by their votes, said "no" to an essential element of comprehensive immigration reform at the very time the Senate is about to take up that measure.

To those Republicans who say, "No, we can't," we need more and more Americans who insist, "Yes, we can." When we harness the energy of these youth, when we reform our immigration laws in a comprehensive way, we will create an America as good as their dream.

NATIONAL CANCER SURVIVOR DAY

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, many families across Minnesota and across the country took the time to recognize National Cancer Survivor Day.

Last year, more than 28,000 Minnesotans were diagnosed with cancer. And while there's hardly anyone who doesn't know a loved one or friend who has suffered from cancer, the good news is that 13.7 million Americans have won their battle against this terrible disease.

One great Twin Cities organization working to ensure that those struggling with cancer do not face it alone is the new Gilda's Club that opened up in Minnetonka, Minnesota, recently.

The American Cancer Society is now setting aggressive goals for the reduction of cancer. Prevention and early detection are key to reaching these goals.

Thanks to advances in medical innovation, it's estimated that over the next 10 years, millions more Americans will have a chance at life after cancer.

Mr. Speaker, let's celebrate with those who have won their fight, as they offer hope that all cancer patients may someday be able to proudly say that they too are cancer survivors.

□ 1150

2013 GRADUATES

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Some years ago, many of us heard of a tsunami. As we approach this weekend of congratulating our wonderful graduates, we

should in fact tell them this is the best and the greatest time of their lives. But it is important for Members of Congress to recognize that we have a task of graduating to do. We must graduate past sequestration and eliminate it, for it is a tsunami against our young people.

We have to in fact graduate past this horrific, pending devastation of an increase in the student loan interest rates that will go from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. That's a tsunami against our young people—our brightest. And we must turn back the clock on an amendment against those who came here as youngsters, through no fault of their own, who are now graduating from places around America, in high schools and colleges. Yes, immigrant children who are undocumented, who want to give back to this Nation, pay their taxes, get a work certificate and give back to those who no longer can work, a tsunami has just come against them.

We have to end this and stand for our children. Congratulations to the 2013 graduates. As I go home to their graduations, I want to give them a gift that America really stands for them.

WHITE HOUSE STANDING IN THE WAY OF GROWING ECONOMY AND ADDING JOBS

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, the scandals embroiling the White House are the result of a culture of contempt for the law that we have seen since the beginning of the Obama administration.

Over the past 4 years, President Obama has demonstrated that dedication to ideology and politics to the exclusion of the rule of law and effectively working to get this economy booming again. Because of this administration's agenda-driven Big Government policies, it is now more difficult for companies in western Pennsylvania to grow and hire additional staff. ObamaCare is raising costs, has discouraged hiring, and threatens access to quality health care. Regulations strangling the financial sector are limiting opportunities for small businesses to add jobs. And just last week, we learned that 134 hardworking employees of a coal company in western Pennsylvania were laid off. They can thank President Obama and his war on coal for altering the market for one of America's most valuable and abundant resources.

President Obama and his administration need to stop their failed Big Government policies, and instead, we need to do all we can to get jobs back to the American people around the Nation.

FLOUR BLUFF NJROTC WINS NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

(Mr. FARENTHOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I recently met up with some future leaders of the district I represent who are members of the Flour Bluff High School Navy Junior ROTC. They won first place this year at the Texas State NJROTC competition and then went on to win the All Service Grand National Championship in Daytona, Florida.

Before they won nationals, I went to their school to congratulate them on their regional win. I wished them good luck on their upcoming national competition. Their skill panned out, and they won. They said the other teams were really strong; but, once again, they won a national championship.

This outstanding group of young men and women, led by Commander Armando Solis, who started the NJROTC unit at Flour Bluff High School in 1993, is a group of winners. At nationals, aside from the Grand National Championship, they won first place in armed dual demilitarized, armed commander, demilitarized inspection, and second place in unarmed guard.

Congratulations to the young men and women of the NJROTC at Flour Bluff High School.

HONORING SECOND LIEUTENANT JUSTIN SISSON AND ARMY SPECIALIST ROBERT ALLAN PIERCE

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize two of America's finest heroes.

I was saddened to learn of the death of 23-year-old Second Lieutenant Justin Sisson. Second Lieutenant Sisson graduated from Blue Valley West High School in Overland Park, Kansas, a suburb of the Third District, which I represent. Sisson was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 506th Infantry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division as an assistant operations officer out of Fort Campbell, Kentucky.

Deployed to Afghanistan with less than a year of Active Duty, Sisson, along with Army Specialist Robert Allan Pierce of Panama, Oklahoma, was killed on Monday by a suicide vehicle-borne improvised explosive device.

With the deaths of Second Lieutenant Justin Sisson and Specialist Robert Pierce, we are once again reminded that freedom is not free. As Americans, we owe a debt of gratitude to these brave men that we simply cannot repay.

Second Lieutenant Sisson and Specialist Pierce will forever be known as

patriots and heroes whose sacrifice will never be forgotten.

PRO-LIFE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there are Kermit Gosnells all over American today inflicting not only violence, cruelty, and death on very young children but excruciating pain as well.

Many Americans, including some who self-identify as pro-choice, were shocked and dismayed by the Gosnell expose and trial. Perhaps the decades-long culture of denial and deceptive marketing has made it difficult to see and understand a disturbing reality. Even after 40 years of abortion-on-demand and over 55 million dead babies and millions of wounded mothers, many—until Gosnell—somehow construed abortion as victimless. That has changed. There are two victims, Mr. Speaker, in every abortion: the mother and her unborn child—three, if twins are involved.

The brutality of severing the spines of defenseless babies, euphemistically called “snipping” by Dr. Gosnell, has finally peeled away the benign facade of the billion-dollar abortion industry. Like Gosnell, abortionists all over America decapitate, dismember, and chemically poison babies to death each and every year. That's what they do.

Americans are connecting the dots and asking whether what Gosnell did is really any different than what all the other abortionists do. And the answer is, no, it's not different. A D&E abortion, which is described here as a common method after 14 months, is a gruesome, pain-filled act of violence that literally rips and tears to pieces the body parts of a child. And that's what they call “choice.” That is what they call safe and legal abortion.

Mr. Speaker, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, authored by Congressman TRENT FRANKS and cosponsored by several Congresswomen and -men, including me, is a modest but absolutely necessary attempt to at least protect some babies, that is to say, those who are 20 weeks old and pain-capable, from having to suffer and die a painful death from abortion.

On May 23, Chairman TRENT FRANKS convened a hearing in the Judiciary Committee's Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee on his legislation. The bill, H.R. 1797, entitled the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, was approved by the subcommittee on June 4 and now moves to the full committee and, hopefully, soon to the full House.

The testimony of several witnesses, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully submit is a must-read for anyone who cares about human rights, for anyone

who cares about women and children. One witness, Dr. Anthony Levatino, a former abortionist, testified that he performed approximately 1,200 abortions. Over 100 of them were second trimester abortions like this D&E procedure that is described here in this graph.

He said:

Imagine, if you can, you are a pro-choice obstetrician/gynecologist like I once was. Your patient today is 24 weeks pregnant. If you could see her baby, which is quite easy on an ultrasound, she would be as long as your hand plus half from the top of her head to the bottom of her rump, not counting the legs. Your patient has been feeling her baby kick for at least a month or more. But now she is asleep on an operating table.

He continued:

With suction of the amniotic fluid, after that is completed, you look for what he called a Sopher clamp. This instrument is about 13 inches long and made of stainless steel. At the business end are located jaws about 2½ inches long and about three-quarters of an initial inch.

This is what he is talking about right here.

□ 1200

This instrument is for grasping and crushing tissue. When it gets hold of something, it does not let go.

A second trimester D&E abortion is a blind procedure. The baby can be in any orientation, he goes on, or position inside the uterus. Picture yourself reaching in with the Sopher clamp and grasping anything that you can.

At 24 weeks' gestation, the uterus is thin and soft, so be careful not to perforate or puncture the walls. Once you've grasped something inside—this doctor, former abortionist, goes on to say—squeeze on the clamp to set the jaws and pull hard. Pull really hard. You feel something let go and out pops a fully formed leg about six inches long. Reach in again and grasp whatever you can, set the jaw, and pull really hard once again and out pops an arm about the same length. Reach in again and again with that clamp and tear out the spine, the intestines, the heart, and the lungs.

The doctor goes on to say that, the toughest part of a D&E abortion is extracting the baby's head. The head of a baby that age is about the size of a large plum and is now free floating inside of the uterine cavity. You can be pretty sure you have hold of it if the Sopher clamp is spread as far as your fingers will allow. You will know you have it right when you crush down on the clamp and you see a white gelatinous material coming through the cervix. That is the baby's brains, this abortionist goes on to say. You can then extract the skull in pieces.

Many times, he went on in his testimony before Trent Franks' subcommittee, many times a little face will come out and stare back at you. Congratulations; you have just successfully performed a second trimester D&E abortion. You just affirmed the right to choose. If you refuse to believe that this procedure inflicts severe pain on that unborn child, please think again. It does.

Another witness, Mr. Speaker, Ms. Jill Stanek, a registered nurse, spoke of appalling stories of abortion survivors and the pain—the pain—the excruciating pain that they suffer when they are being aborted.

She pointed out that when she testified before the committee back in 2001:

it was to tell of her experience as a registered nurse in the labor and delivery department at Christ Hospital in Oak Lawn, Illinois, where she discovered babies were being aborted alive and shelved, put on a shelf to die in the department's soiled utility closet.

Indeed, this nurse went on to say at the hearing:

I was traumatized and changed forever by my experience of holding a little abortion survivor for 45 minutes until he died—a 21- to 22-week-old baby who had been aborted because he had Down syndrome.

Since then, other appalling stories of abortion survivors either being abandoned or killed have trickled out.

In 2005, a mother delivered a 23-week-old baby in a toilet at an EPOC clinic in Orlando, Florida, and was shocked to see this little guy move. Abortion staff not only refused to help, but turned away paramedics, who her friend had notified by calling 911. Angele, the woman, could do no more than helplessly sit on the floor rocking and singing to her baby for 11 minutes until that infant died.

In 2006, Sycyloria Williams delivered her 23-week-old baby born on a recliner at a GYN diagnostic center in Hialeah, Florida. When he began breathing and moving, abortion clinic owner Belkis Gonzalez cut the umbilical cord and zipped him into a biohazard bag, still alive.

The Kermit Gosnell case provides further evidence that the lines between infanticide and legal feticide, both via abortion, have become blurred. This abortionist was convicted only last week—that's when she was talking, when she testified—of three counts of first degree murder.

And also last week, as she went on to say, in yet another revelation and photos from three former employees who alleged that abortionist Douglas Karpen in Houston, Texas, routinely kills babies after they are born by puncturing the soft spot at the top of the head, or impaling the stomach with a sharp instrument, twisting off the head, or puncturing the throat with his finger.

Mr. Speaker, if that's not child abuse in its most extreme form, I don't know what is.

It is easy to be horrified, she went on in her testimony to say, this nurse, by heart-wrenching stories such as these and to imagine the torture abortion survivors endure as they are being killed. But it is somehow not so easy for some to envision preborn babies the same age being tortured as they are killed by similar methods.

Today, premature babies are routinely given pain relief who are born at the same age as babies who are torn limb from limb or injected in the heart during abortions.

Even the World Health Organization goes so far as to recommend analgesia for premies getting simple heel pricks for a couple of drops of blood. Likewise, prenatal surgery is commonplace, and along with it, anesthesia for babies being operated on even in the middle of

pregnancy. Meanwhile, babies of identical age are being torn apart by D&E abortions with no pain relief whatsoever. Again, they suffer, and they suffer horribly.

It must be that some people inexplicably think that the uterus provides a firewall against fetal pain, or that babies marked for abortion are somehow numb while their wanted counterparts aren't. They're not numb. They feel every single bit of killing, whether it's the Sopher clamp or any other instrument is being used to dismember or to decapitate.

She concludes by saying:

This thinking is better suited for the Middle Ages than for modern medicine.

Mr. Speaker, today there is ample documentation that unborn children experience serious pain from at least the 20th week—and most likely even before that. When it comes to pain, all of us go through great lengths to mitigate its severity and its duration. None of us ever want to die a painful death. Unborn children deserve no less.

I yield to the prime sponsor of this very important legislation, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), the chairman of the committee and, like I said, the author of the bill.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I don't often do this, but I'm going to step away from my prepared remarks just a moment and express a sincere gratitude to Congressman CHRIS SMITH.

Mr. Speaker, years ago, when I came to Washington the very first time, it was on a weekend. I couldn't come here and visit the Congress, but I came to the congressional halls of where their offices were. There were two offices that I visited. One was the late Henry Hyde—one of the greatest human beings to ever sit in this place—and the other was CHRIS SMITH. I just have to say to you—I know it embarrasses him terribly, but this is my heart—I believe this man to be truly one of the greatest heroes in this Congress. All the 30-plus years that he has been here, he has given everything he had to protect little children who couldn't vote for him.

I am just convinced, in the councils of eternity, that someone is going to look him in the eyes one day when he crosses over that threshold and say, "Well done." And I am just grateful that we have men like that here.

Mr. Speaker, DANIEL WEBSTER once said:

Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution and to the Republic for which it stands. For miracles do not cluster—and America is a miracle, Mr. Speaker. For miracles do not cluster, and what has happened once in 6,000 years may never happen again. So hold on to the Constitution. For if the American Constitution should fall, there will be anarchy throughout the world.

Our Founding Fathers wrote the words of our Constitution down for us because they didn't want us to forget their true meaning or to otherwise fall prey to those who would deliberately

undermine or destroy it. This has always been the preeminent reason why we write down documents or agreements or declarations or constitutions in the first place, to preserve their original meaning and intent.

□ 1210

Mr. Speaker, it really causes us to ask ourselves the question: Why was all of this effort made? Why are we really here in this Chamber?

And I would suggest to you that if we simply avail ourselves of the most cursory glance of the Founding Fathers, we are all here to protect the lives of Americans and their constitutional rights. And protecting the lives of Americans and their constitutional rights is the reason Congress exists in the first place.

The phrases in the Fifth and the 14th Amendments capulate our entire Constitution when they proclaim that “no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.” It’s that simple. Those words are a crystal clear reflection of our Constitution and the proclamation that the Declaration of Independence put forward to all of us when it declared that “all men”—and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that’s all little babies too—“are created equal and endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, those being life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” Those words are the essence of America, and our commitment to them for more than two centuries has set America apart as the flagship of human freedom in the world. It has made us the “unipolar superpower” of this planet, and yet unspeakable suffering and tragedy have occurred whenever we have strayed from those foundational words.

Our own United States Supreme Court did exactly that, Mr. Speaker, when they ruled that millions of men, women, and children were not persons under the Constitution because their skin was the wrong color. It took a horrible Civil War and the deaths of over 600,000 Americans to reverse that unspeakable tragedy. And we saw that same arrogance in 1973 when the Supreme Court said “the unborn child was not a person under the Constitution.” And we have since witnessed the silent deaths of now over 55 million innocent little boys and baby girls who died without the protection of the Constitution, the protection that the Constitution gave them, and without the protection this Congress should have had the courage to defend.

Mr. Speaker, the recent trial of Kermit Gosnell has played an instrumental role in exposing late-term abortions for what they really are—relocated infanticide. Kermit Gosnell is this now famous late-term abortionist convicted of murder, in part, for using scissors to cut the spinal cords of numerous little babies who had survived abortion attempts. One of his employees said that in one case that there was

this little baby that had been so damaged by the process that it no longer had eyes or a mouth, but she could hear him screeching and making this sound like a little alien.

I know sometimes, Mr. Speaker, we deliberately try to hide those things from our minds. I know I do. But once in awhile it’s important just to think on the life of this one little child that was only in this world outside the womb for a few minutes and found nothing but horror and suffering, not knowing why, not knowing what the purpose or the reason was, and no one was there. I just have to say to you, Mr. Speaker, if that isn’t wrong, then we can absolve ourselves forever because nothing is wrong. Had Kermit Gosnell done the same thing mere moments before when that little baby was still inside the womb, in many States in this union, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, it would have been entirely legal.

We’ve seen similarly other late-term abortionists across this country exposed for such incomprehensibly barbaric practices. LeRoy Carhart in Maryland compared a “baby in the womb before an abortion” to “meat in a crock pot.”

Abortion clinic employees in Arizona explained to a woman seeking an abortion at 24 weeks that “sometimes they are sometimes alive, yeah, but it doesn’t necessarily mean that it”—the baby—“will come out whole.”

Douglas Karpen in Texas has been accused by four separate employees of killing three to four born-alive babies per day by either cutting their spinal cords, forcing instruments in their soft spots on their heads, or twisting their heads off, completely off of their necks with his bare hands.

Very simply, Mr. Speaker, the public is beginning to learn that there are scores of other Kermit Gosnells out there. He was not an aberration. One of the saddest things that we must not miss here, is that as evil as this man was, and the horrible things that he did, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, they are not uncommon in America. And because of this, Americans are beginning to realize that somehow we are bigger than abortion on demand, and that 55 million dead children are enough.

We are beginning to ask the real question: Does abortion take the life of a child? Mr. Speaker, that is the question that I would put before all of my colleagues and anyone in the sound of my voice, to ask themselves in their heart—put aside the rationalization just for a moment and ask yourself: Does abortion take the life of a child? If it does not, I’m willing to walk out of here and never mention the subject again. But if abortion really does kill a little baby, if it really does, then those of us sitting here in the seat of freedom, in the greatest, the most powerful Nation in the history of humanity, also find ourselves standing in the midst of the greatest human genocide in the history of the world.

Throughout America’s history, the hearts of the American people have always been moved with compassion when they discover a theretofore hidden class of victims. Once the humanity of the victim and the inhumanity of what is being done to them finally becomes clear in their minds, America changes their heart.

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, America is on the cusp of another such realization. And I fear if we fail to respond this time—because after this, after Kermit Gosnell, no excuse remains, we have seen the worst—if we do not respond, then we will slide into that Sumerian darkness where the light of human compassion has gone out and where the survival of the fittest has prevailed over humanity, and it must not happen on our watch in this generation.

Medical science regarding the development of unborn babies and their capacities at various stages of growth has advanced dramatically, and it incontrovertibly demonstrates that unborn children clearly do experience pain. The single greatest hurdle to legislation like H.R. 3803 has always been that opponents deny unborn babies feel pain at all, as if somehow the ability to feel pain magically develops instantaneously as a child passes through the birth canal.

Mr. Speaker, this level of deliberate ignorance might have found excuse in earlier eras of human history, but the evidence available to us today is extensive and irrefutable: unborn children have the capacity to experience pain, at least by 20 weeks and, as Congressman SMITH said, very likely substantially earlier.

This information, Mr. Speaker, is at www.doctorsonfetalpain.org. I would sincerely recommend to anyone in this Chamber that is interested to really know the truth to go there and find out for themselves, rather than to have their understanding cemented in some earlier time when scientists still believed in spontaneous generation, and that the Earth was flat. That is the invincible ignorance sometimes that we find ourselves trying to break through on this seminal civil rights issue of our time.

Most Americans think that late-term abortions are rare, but in fact there are approximately 120,000 late-term abortions in America every year, or more than 325 late-term abortions every day in America. Mr. Speaker, I believe we’re better than that. We’re better than 325 late-term abortions every day in this country. I believe that we’re better than dismembering babies who can feel pain at every agonizing moment. And I sincerely hope that we can at the very least come together to agree that we can draw a line in the sand at that point. That we can agree that knowingly subjecting our innocent unborn children to dismemberment in the womb, particularly when they have developed to the point when they can feel excruciating pain every

terrible moment leading up to their undeserved deaths, belies everything America was called to be. This is not who we are.

□ 1220

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing to babies is real. It is barbaric in the purest sense of the word. It is the greatest human rights violation occurring on U.S. soil, and it has already victimized millions of pain-capable babies since the Supreme Court gave us all abortion-on-demand that tragic day in 1973.

Thomas Jefferson said that the care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government. And ladies and gentlemen, using taxpayer dollars to fund the killing of innocent unborn children does not liberate their mothers. It leaves their mothers oftentimes with the brokenness and the emotional consequences without anyone there to really recognize what they have dealt with. It is not the cause for which those lying out under the white stones in Arlington National Cemetery died, and it is not good government.

Abraham Lincoln called upon all of us to remember America's Founding Fathers and their enlightened belief that nothing stamped with the Divine image and likeness was sent into this world to be trodden on or degraded and imbrued by its fellows.

He reminded those he called posterity—those, us—that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest should set up a doctrine that some were not entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness that their posterity—that is us, ladies and gentlemen—might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began.

Mr. Speaker, may that be the commitment to all of us today.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman from Arizona, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for their passion and also for their sharing with us today such an important issue that faces us as a country. It is a privilege and an honor to stand here with Mr. SMITH and Mr. FRANKS. I thank you for your work, for all you have done for so long on an issue that is close to my heart and close to many people's hearts across the country as well. To see the picture here that Mr. SMITH showed, if that doesn't touch a part of you, I don't know what will. So thank you for the information and for the heart that you show for these little ones that are blessed with life until it is ended in such a brutal way.

Mr. Speaker, the horrific case of Kermit Gosnell stripped away the abortion industry's euphemisms and showed that abortion isn't safe and that it isn't rare. Gosnell murdered newborn babies; he preyed on vulnerable women; and he stuffed bodies into freezers, trash bags and cat food tins. While a jury has handed down its ver-

dict for Kermit Gosnell, we as the American people must render our verdict on abortion.

Americans must take a hard look at abortion's grim reality. Gosnell's clinic, the court case and the verdict for Kermit Gosnell brought us as Americans face-to-face with the brutality of abortion. We cannot turn our backs on it now. It is time for an open and honest discussion about abortion in this country. Kermit Gosnell's crimes shocked civilized people everywhere.

The inescapable truth is that there is no moral distinction between ending a child's life 5 seconds after birth or 5 weeks before. Sadly, across this country, abortion providers like Planned Parenthood routinely perform brutal late-term abortions on unborn children who are able to feel pain. The end result at a Planned Parenthood clinic is the same result that occurred at Kermit Gosnell's clinic—and that is death.

So I am proud to stand here today to cosponsor Mr. FRANKS' legislation to prohibit the gruesome abortions of unborn children, who can feel pain. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his consistent and strong support of the measure and, to a larger extent, for his support for the unborn children as we've seen today as he spoke so eloquently from the floor.

Today, I am proud to join my colleagues Mr. SMITH, Mr. HARRIS and others who have stood up for those who cannot speak for themselves. I am confident that we will expose big abortion's lies and restore a lasting respect for innocent life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Mr. STUTZMAN, for your eloquent remarks as well as those of Chairman FRANKS', who is compassionate and courageous like you and like our next speaker, who is also eloquent in the defense of the most defenseless.

I would like to yield to Dr. ANDY HARRIS, who is a board-certified anesthesiologist at Johns Hopkins Hospital Medical Center.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for organizing this because we come to Washington to make tough decisions. That's what the country expects of us.

Mr. Speaker, I will offer the fact that one of the most difficult decisions we have to come to grips with is when do we begin to protect human life. The gentleman from Arizona was absolutely right. We have to answer the question: Does abortion take the life of a human child? If we all agree that it does, then we have to ask ourselves and come to an agreement on at what point do we begin to protect that life; at what point are we as a Nation going to say that human life is worthy of protection.

Now, as a physician, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you I am always puzzled by the question because, scientifically, everyone who has taken a genetics course knows that, from the moment of con-

ception, it is a unique human life. The one-cell embryo is a unique human life, different from every other one in the world—ever. Every cell in each and every one of our bodies has the exact DNA that we had when we were one cell big. The only difference is the number of cells we had. One would argue, certainly, as the illustration here shows, that this is not a one-celled fetus, or baby—it's a human being that given time will grow, that will grow to be your size or my size. I'm 6-foot-4. I'm a little bigger than normal. Some people are shorter than average, but we're all human beings, so size doesn't make the difference.

Again, from a scientific point of view, to me, it's clear: it is a human life from conception and should be protected. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I understand the country doesn't agree. Some people don't agree it should be protected. So the question is: At what point do you protect it?

A lot of people would say at this point it probably is worth protecting that human life. Certainly, the jury in Pennsylvania said that you couldn't kill that baby right after it was born. Strangely enough, Federal law, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, says that it can be legal to kill that child 5 minutes before that birth. I think most Americans find that repulsive—that with a baby at almost 9-months' gestation, in many States, it is legal to kill that child 5 minutes before birth, but in Pennsylvania it resulted in three murder sentences because it was 5 minutes after birth.

So what this bill says is let's come together, and let's agree on a time when human life is going to be protected. It's not going to be a perfect agreement. It's going to be arbitrary because, again, that human life started when it was one cell large. At conception, that human life started. We all agree that, Mr. Speaker, you and I are human life and worthy of protection, so the only question is: Where do we draw the line?

Again, the gentleman from Arizona suggested correctly that we need to draw that line. This bill attempts to draw the line. The Supreme Court attempted to draw a very clumsy drawing of the line in the *Roe v. Wade* decision because it said it is viability, but the problem is that viability, over the 30-plus years I've practiced medicine, has changed. It's a moving target.

□ 1230

Viability then was 25 weeks. Now it's 23 $\frac{3}{4}$. It's a moving line. And what does viability mean? Viability means it can survive without the support of that mother.

That's a little arbitrary, Mr. Speaker. If that mother had an elderly mother or grandmother at home, perhaps disabled with Alzheimer's disease, totally dependent on that mother—now, it's not their mother, but it's the mother of a child, a fetus. That grown-up could be totally dependent on that

other human being, that other human adult; and yet that human adult doesn't have the option of saying, Well, since that individual is dependent upon me, I can make a life-and-death decision for that individual. No, that would be wrong. We'd all say that's wrong. So we're going to have to draw the line somewhere.

This bill says, Let's do it when we believe that baby begins to feel pain, that, in fact, a D&E procedure will be exceedingly painful. Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what happens in a D&E procedure. The fetus, the baby is literally torn apart. Literally. This is what happens with it.

So we're all going to have to agree that, first of all, this is certainly not pleasant to look at. The medical illustrations when I was studying, of course, which was around the time of *Roe v. Wade*, didn't have this kind of illustration; but abortion policy in this country in the past 30 years forces us to actually illustrate what it looks like. This is it.

So this bill says—again, in the context of the Gosnell trial showing all America that—and I think almost all America agrees that what happened in Pennsylvania, knowingly killing by snipping the spinal cord of an alive, awake baby right after an abortion procedure that resulted in a live birth is, in fact, murder. It's the taking of a human life subject to punishment.

But most people would say, How are we going to protect this child? I offer that this is a compromise that maybe we all can work around and say that if that child during that procedure feels pain, then it probably should be protected under our law.

The question again is not clear cut. There will be some disagreement among people when that pain can be felt. There's a lot of indication scientifically and chemically and with neurodevelopment that that child feels pain at 20 weeks. It's certainly a little more subject to discussion whether it's earlier.

I will tell you later shouldn't be subject to discussion because, Mr. Speaker, you know that if you do a procedure on a premature infant born and brought to the neonatal intensive care unit, you actually administer pain relievers when you do the procedure. So the medical community has already decided that by 23 weeks it already feels pain; and believe me, Mr. Speaker, it didn't magically occur with birth, the ability to feel pain.

Again, we can know by the development of the nervous system, by things we can see and measure. We believe that at 20 weeks that fetus, that baby, can feel pain and therefore deserves protection.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that's a compromise we all ought to be able to work with. Again, it is a compromise because, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that human life does begin at conception. The discussion here is not going to be when human life begins. It's when

should this body, this Congress, this government protect the most innocent of human life.

I'm going to agree that I think it's very reasonable to say when this fetus, this baby, can feel the pain of that procedure, it ought to be protected in some ways. Is it the perfect way? Maybe not. But we ought to begin that discussion because right now, Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's interpretation of the law allows a State to allow an abortion that kills a baby right up to the moment of birth, and that's just not right. We need to set some line in law.

Again, I'll agree with the gentleman from Arizona that it may not be a perfect line, but we all have to agree we need to draw it to begin thinking about it; and I would suggest this is a reasonable one. When are we no longer going to subject that baby to the pain of a procedure and begin to protect that baby's life?

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey again. He's brought the issue before this body. If we believe that this is just some abstract thought about when we protect human life, as I've spoken about on the floor and the gentleman from New Jersey has—Mr. Speaker, I suggest if you want some very interesting reading tonight, go home and Google the *Journal of Medical Ethics* and look for the article published last November where academics from Australia and Italy wrote an article suggesting that it should be all right to kill a human baby up to some certain amount of time after birth if that human baby is inconvenient to the mother and the family to which it belongs.

I would offer, Mr. Speaker, I hope that never happens in this country, that that suggestion never takes root here. I think we would find that horrendous. But it does bring up the question that if we find it so horrendous 1 minute after birth, shouldn't it be horrendous 1 minute before birth? And if it's 1 minute before birth, how about 1 week? How about 1 month? How about 2 months? We can go all the way back. Should it be when the heartbeat appears at 7 weeks? At 7 weeks' gestation, the heartbeat appears. Even earlier. Should it be when the baby moves, when quickening is felt? That's the medical term: quickening.

This bill sets a reasonable point of discussion. Let's do it when we think a baby would feel the pain of that abortion.

CHINESE HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank my good friend and very distinguished colleague, Dr. ANDY HARRIS, for his very eloquent and very incisive remarks and for his leadership on behalf of human rights in general, including here in the United States.

We've been discussing human rights abuse here in the United States in trying to defend at least pain-capable unborn children from the violence of abortion. I would like to focus for a few

moments on human rights abuse that is occurring halfway around the world in China.

Tomorrow, President Obama will meet with Chinese President Xi Jinping in California to discuss security and economic issues. A robust discussion of human rights abuses in China, however, must be on the agenda and not in a superfluous or superficial way.

It is time to get serious about China's flagrant abuse of human rights. It's time for this President, this administration to end its manifest indifference towards human rights abuse in the People's Republic of China. It's time for President Obama to cease his numbing indifference towards the victims of Beijing's abuse.

Mr. Speaker, can a dictatorship that crushes the rights and freedoms of its own people be trusted on trade and security?

China today is the torture capital of the world, and victims include religious believers, ethnic minorities, human rights defenders like Chen Guancheng and Gao Zhisheng and hundreds and thousands of political dissidents.

If you are a political or religious dissident or believer of the Underground Christian Church, Falun Gong, a part of the Uyghur Muslim minority or Tibetan Buddhist, if you are arrested, you will be tortured, and in some cases you will be tortured to death.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of millions of women have been forced to abort their precious babies pursuant to China's draconian one-child policy which has led to gendercide, the violent extermination of unborn baby girls simply because they are girls. The slaughter of the girl child in China is not only a massive gender crime, but a security issue, as well.

□ 1240

A witness at one of my hearings that I chaired—I chair the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations. Over the years, I have chaired over 46 congressional hearings focused exclusively on China's human rights issues. One of the witnesses at one of my earlier hearings, Valerie Hudson, author of a book called "Bare Branches," testified that gender imbalance will lead to instability and chaos and even to war because of the domestic chaos and instability that will occur. And that the one child has not enhanced China's security, but it has demonstrably weakened it.

Nick Eberstadt, the world-renowned AEI demographer, has famously phrased it and asked the question: What are the consequences for a society that has chosen to become simultaneously more gray and more male—the missing daughters, by the tens of millions in China—as a direct result of sex-selection abortion?

In 2000, Mr. Speaker, I authored a law known as the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000. It is our landmark

law in combating the hideous crime of modern-day slavery, sex, and labor trafficking. China has now become the magnet for the traffickers, buying and selling women as commodities, selling them in China against their will, of course, through coercion, because of the missing girls, the missing daughters, and the missing young women.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the world remembered the dream that was and is the Tiananmen Square protest of 1989 and deeply honored the sacrifice endured by an extraordinarily brave group of pro-democracy Chinese women and men who dared to demand fundamental human rights for all Chinese. Twenty-four years ago this week, the world watched in awe and wonder, as it has since mid-April of 1989, as hundreds of thousands of mostly young people peacefully petitioned the Chinese Government to reform and to democratize. China seemed to be the next impending triumph for freedom and democracy, especially after the collapse of the dictatorships of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact nations. But when the People's Liberation Army poured in and around the square on June 3, the wonder of Tiananmen turned to shock, tears, fear, and helplessness. On June 3 and 4, and for days, weeks, and years, right up until today, the Chinese dictatorship delivered a barbaric response—mass murder, torture, incarceration, the systematic suppression of fundamental human rights, and coverup.

The Chinese Government not only continues to inflict unspeakable pain and suffering on its own people, but the coverup of the Tiananmen Square massacre is without precedent in modern history. Even though journalists and live television and radio documented the massacre, the Chinese Communist Party lies and continues to deny it, that it even occurred, to obfuscate, and to threaten anyone who dares speak out in China about the massacre and all of the terrible barbarity that followed.

In December of 1996, Mr. Speaker, General Chi Haotian, the operational commander who ordered the murder of the Tiananmen protesters, visited Washington, D.C., as the Chinese Defense Minister. You see, he was promoted after he killed all of those innocent people. Minister Chi was welcomed by President Clinton at the White House with full military honors, including a 19-gun salute—a bizarre spectacle that I and many others on both sides of the aisle protested. But why do I bring this up now? General Chi addressed the Army War College on that trip and in answer to a question said:

Not a single person lost his life in Tiananmen Square.

He claimed that the People's Liberation Army did nothing more violent than the "pushing of people" during the 1989 protest. Not a single person lost his or her life? Are you kidding?

That big lie and countless others like it, however, is, and it was then, the

Communist Party's line about Tiananmen.

As chair of the Foreign Affairs Human Rights Committee then, I put together a congressional hearing within 2 days—December 8, 1996—and witnesses who were there on Tiananmen Square in 1989, including Dr. Yang Jianli, a leader and survivor of the massacre, and Time magazine Bureau Chief David Aikman, who were actually witnesses at my hearing this past Monday. We also invited Minister Chi, or anyone the Chinese Embassy might want to send to the hearing to give an accounting of that blatant lie. I guess Minister Chi thought he was back in Beijing when he was at the Army War College where the big lie is king and no one ever dares to do a fact check.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Department of State asked the Chinese Government to "end harassment of those who participated in the protest of 1989 and fully account for those killed, detained, or missing." What was the response from the Chinese Government? The Chinese Foreign Ministry acrimoniously said that the United States should "stop interfering in China's internal affairs so as not to sabotage China-U.S. relations."

We have heard that line from the Soviet Union. We heard it from those who supported apartheid in South Africa: Don't interfere.

Human rights are universal, and we need to speak out boldly and without fear when they are violated, wherever and whenever they occur.

"Sabotage" Sino-American relations because our side requests an end to harassment and an accounting? It sounds to me like they have much to hide.

Therefore, Mr. President, tomorrow when you meet with the unelected President of China, and Saturday when you meet with him as well, please be informed, be bold, be tenacious, and seriously raise human rights with Chinese President Xi. No superficial intervention. No checking off on the box. Yes, I raised human rights. Raise real names. Ask for their release. Raise real issues, like the horrific one child per couple policy or the endemic use of torture by the Chinese dictatorship. Raise the 16 cases that are being raised and given to you to raise of individuals, people who in China are like the modern-day Natan Sharansky or others who have suffered so much for freedom for all these years—like Gao Zhisheng and others.

Mr. Speaker, we will not forget what took place in Tiananmen Square 24 years ago this past Monday and Tuesday. The struggle for freedom in China continues. Some day the people of China will enjoy all of their God-given fundamental human rights; and as a nation of free Chinese women and men, they will some day honor and applaud all those who suffered so much in the Laogai, the Chinese gulags, and sacrificed so much for so long.

Mr. President, the ball is in your court. President Obama, raise these

issues and do it in a robust, sincere, yes, diplomatic, but very powerful way.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

POISON PILL AMENDMENT IN HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today greatly saddened and disappointed in this House of Representatives. I was prepared to vote in support of the Homeland Security appropriations bill for the upcoming fiscal year, a bill that is supposed to ensure our local law enforcement, emergency responders, antiterrorism experts, and border security professionals have the resources they need to keep our country safe. Instead, we see a bipartisan and widely agreed upon bill that would fund Homeland Security efforts across the Nation be overtaken by a violently controversial amendment from the gentleman from Iowa that was included in the final passage of the bill.

The last-minute amendment goes beyond the pale of discrimination by prohibiting funding to implement President Obama's deferred action plan from last year that would protect DREAMERS from deportation. This poison pill amendment endangers over 800,000 young undocumented immigrants who have no home other than the United States and only want a fair shot at an education and opportunity to pursue their passions out of the shadows.

I voted against final passage of the Homeland Security appropriations bill because this amendment was allowed to be passed by the Republican majority, and I am deeply saddened that over 220 of my colleagues in this Chamber want to shatter those dreams.

□ 1250

UPHOLDING THE TRUST OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIDENSTINE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a privilege to be able to come to the floor and begin a dialogue, because there's one thing that I think is vital. We could hold up the Constitution, which I often do. We can speak with great eloquence on the floor of the House, even go to our districts and speak to our constituents.

But I do think it is important that the trust of the American people, even though sometimes tattered, sometimes challenged, that what we can at least adhere to are the values of this Nation,

the constitutional underpinnings that we all are created equal under the Declaration of Independence and those vital 10 amendments that make up the Bill of Rights, among others, that really go to the trust that the American people have in their government and in their documents that are the infrastructure of government.

And when I say that, I am not in any way diminishing some very emotional debate that we've had over the years. We've engaged in debates on war and peace. We've engaged in debates on impeachment. Tragically, we've seen assassinations of our Presidents. We've seen assassination attempts on our Presidents, and so I know that the issue of trust or the issue of stability sometimes wobbles because it is human nature.

We've seen the tragedy of 9/11. But yet, Americans, by and large, with polls going up and down, will probably be more trustworthy than any other population of people. Why?

Because they have a sense that, even in the midst of vigorous disagreement between the partisans, between Republicans and Democrats and Independents, that there's something that holds America together.

And so I am rising today to try to be able to weave in and out why we must get back to that trust, and why it serves us no purpose to go on an unsubstantiated witch hunt on what is one of the finest public servants that this country has seen, and that is the Attorney General of the United States, Eric H. Holder, Jr.

Now, I will be discussing a number of items because, in the course of this discussion, I realize that some will agree and some will not. But minimally, what I would like to ensure is that we have a forthright and truthful discussion. That's really what is key.

I base that upon being a battle-worn member of the House Judiciary Committee for any number of years. I have ascended to the position where you are called a senior member of the Judiciary Committee. And in the course of my work there, I have seen investigations that are far and wide.

I lived through the horrific heinousness of 9/11, and having to craft something called the Patriot Act, which still needs to be challenged, and we need to err on the side of the rights of the American people.

I have seen the investigation of the tragedy of Waco. Many people might not even remember that, the terrible loss of life.

I've seen the throngs pulling a child, a Cuban child, between families—Elian Gonzales.

I've seen the ups and downs of immigration and the debate about where we should go on immigration reform.

I have seen the issues of impeachment and attempts on impeachment, trying to uphold civil rights, trying to write a Patriot Act—which came out of the Judiciary Committee right after 9/11, in our most vulnerable time—in a

bipartisan way that balanced the rights of Americans alongside of the responsibilities that we had to secure America.

I have seen the fight for individual rights, and I'd like to think that when it comes to that challenge, that when you look at the record that I have offered, you have seen a record that prizes individual rights.

So I do not believe that it is of any value, no matter what party you're in, to be in a coverup. Coverups usually wind up with the covers being taken off, and so there's not really much advantage to a coverup.

But I want to discuss, away from the aura of cameras and hysteria, the work of a public servant that I've known for a number of years. Having come to this Congress a few years ago, I remember that Attorney General Holder not only worked for Democratic Presidents, but also worked for Republican Presidents.

In fact, George Bush II held Mr. Holder as his Acting Attorney General, or Deputy Attorney General, which is the highest ranking under the Attorney General. The view of him as an unbiased figure allowed him to be, in essence, that bridge between administrations.

He has served as a judge. He has been a prosecutor. He has likewise, prosecuted those who would do Americans harm. He is a son, if you will, of those who struggled to overcome.

And he had the honor of being appointed, named as President Clinton's Deputy Attorney General, the first African American to be so named.

He pulled himself up by his bootstraps, having graduated from Columbia College, as he's so proud of, in New York, attended the public schools, even schools that I'm familiar with—some of my friends graduated from Stuyvesant High School—where he earned something that was very much sought after in those times, a Regents Scholarship. That allowed him to attend Columbia College, where he majored in American history, and he graduated from Columbia law school.

He is not one to accept your challenge of the affection he has for his college and his law school.

He had a sense of desire to do good. And in those times, one of the premiere civil rights law firms was the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund. No, it is not the NAACP. This is a lawyers' group that would defend you, no matter who you were.

In fact, I remember Constance Baker Motley, out of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, defending the Klan in Alabama, because it is the motto and mission of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund that if your rights are abridged, no matter who you are, we will stand up for those rights.

And so he started there, with a very refined sense of right and wrong and who should be defended, and wound up at the Department of Justice as what you call a line lawyer, Criminal Division.

And then he joined, previously, I guess, he joined the U.S. Department of Justice Attorney General's Honors Program. He was assigned to the public integrity section, was tasked to investigate and prosecute official corruption, local, State and Federal levels.

Some might say, when you saw Eric coming, you wanted to get out of the way. That was his sense of justice, balanced and fair, attacking those who were doing wrong to our system of justice and fairness, and yes, going after corruption in local, State and Federal government.

Those were many years since 1976, and if I would take a guess, if he were going to falter in the practice of law, or in the upholding of justice, he would have faltered a long time ago.

□ 1300

Sorry, Mr. Attorney General, but you have been around for a long time; 1976 is a long time. In fact, if I recall correctly, 1976 was in the midst of when President Carter was coming in and after President Ford had served. So he has seen both Republican and Democratic administrations, and he has passed muster by his superiors. He's climbed up the ladder. He served in private business and private practice. He's not a new kid on the block.

I had the chance to be with his wife, Dr. Sharon Malone, one of the premier physicians in this community, who has her own legacy, as well as the legacy of her sister, who was one of those who integrated the universities in Alabama during the segregated South. But the interesting thing about Eric is that he does not come with a sense of entitlement, which I don't like even using that word, because if you fix something that is broken, if you try to integrate because it is segregated, that is not entitlement. If you try to ensure someone has an opportunity, it is not negative when you say affirmatively you want to make sure that there is diversity. But Eric takes life as he sees it. And so it baffled me when we were proceeding through this process.

Somebody said bad things come in threes. I don't want to start that because I'm hoping we don't have any threes coming along. I've got to get on an airplane in a couple of minutes.

But I would say to you that I would like the answer to some of the questions. Obviously, Benghazi falls in the State Department. But we've certainly had the misfortunes of the IRS. I want to clarify that the IRS falls independently. The Commissioners are appointed on a 6-year term so that they do not have the political influence of a Presidential appointment. But their ultimate oversight is through the Secretary of the Treasury under the U.S. Department of the Treasury. Certainly, that investigation is going forward at this time. But it seems like all of that was piling on someone who was not directly involved: Benghazi and the IRS.

But let's get to the one that has drawn the most ire, rightly so. Let me

temper that because I know that the IRS is drawing a great deal of ire. I've come to the floor and indicated that there are a lot of good, hardworking employees. Maybe you know some of them. Our colleagues see these people in our districts. They're working every day to ensure that the American people, who pay them, who own all of this in the United States Government, are treated fairly. I know there are people like that. But certainly, we are absolutely outraged about any prosecuting in a biased way for political beliefs. That is an absolute, unpardonable sin, if you will, under the First Amendment. We've all agreed to that. We want a full investigation. And I can assure you if any parts of the Department of Justice are involved in a criminal investigation, if it is discovered—and we have an Inspector General under the IRS—you can be assured that the Department of Justice will be involved in determining whether any criminal activities have gone on as relates to the IRS.

But what has drawn the most ire—and it should—is the precious press and the right to be told what is going on. Again, with a little bit of humor, I will tell you that those of us in the public eye really like that press story that says that we're cutting a ribbon for something that has been given from the Federal Government or making the grand speech that someone will quote that was most erudite and astute.

But the press should be unfettered because it is the right of the American people to know what is going on in their government, no matter what level it is, from the school board to the county clerk to the statehouse to the city government and to your Federal Government. Maybe, to the chagrin of many who are found out in the press, we understand.

So when it is suggested that the Department of Justice would violate that sacred trust of blocking information to the American public, then obviously there is an enormous amount of concern. And I understand that. And I think it is enormously important to lay out this whole question of the Fox reporter, the gentleman who has been working on a number of projects, and the whole idea of the release of the emails of the Associated Press, or the targeting of them, and the targeting of one particular individual, Mr. Rosen of Fox News, and the May 15 hearing in the House Judiciary Committee, at which I was present.

I wanted to speak of what I know. One of the questions I raised, just a yes-or-no answer, was whether Mr. Holder had been a supporter of what we call the Shield Act in his professional career, a bill that had been supported by many of us in the last session, or before, and that is to block or protect reporters and their proprietary information under the First Amendment. And for some reason, my good friends on the other side of the aisle, Republicans, did not see fit for that legislation to pass.

So here we are in a set of circumstances that speaks ill of anyone that would target a reporter or this enormous leak of emails. All of this is being reviewed. But I want to focus on Attorney General Holder and the very excellent Attorney General that he had in charge. He did not participate in the ultimate investigation and the determination for the ultimate subpoenas regarding the AP. It was done after some 15,000 pages of documents were issued, and they still could not determine how the leak, where the leak, or who would be the culprit of the leak. This is pertaining to issues that would have a detrimental impact on the security of the American people.

So let me be very clear: it was not the reporters. It was to find out who was, for lack of a better term, the leaker. And, yes, those are sources. That's the angst of the people; the lawyers entrusted with your protection in the Department of Justice. There is no doubt Congress has a right to restrain it, for you elect us in the people's House to make sure that you are protected from that kind of intrusion. But let it be very clear that the intrusion was not to entrap reporters. It was to ensure us that we were protecting the American people.

So all of a sudden the Attorney General is in the hot seat. He recused himself from further investigation. A number of questions were posed in that May 15 hearing. And one of the questions posed was seeking a clarification about different laws but also asking the question about allowing for reporters to be prosecuted. I have a paraphrasing but a fair handle on the answer of the Attorney General. In fact, if you can pay attention to newspaper accounts to precisely see if this is correct:

With regard to the potential prosecution of the press for the disclosure material, that is not something I have ever been involved in—heard of—or think would be a wise policy.

The active word is “potential” prosecution—prosecution.

□ 1310

Yes, there was an FBI affidavit used to obtain the warrant for Rosen's emails, and there was probable cause—and this was in 2010—to determine whether any law had been broken. Yes, that was done. The affidavit did describe this reporter, by way of reports, as an aider and abettor and/or coconspirator. But the Justice Department did not prosecute Mr. Rosen, did not even file charges against him while he was listed as a coconspirator. No charges were ever raised against him. No charges were pulled back. No acquittal. No prosecution.

So the answer of the Attorney General was accurate. To the extent that anyone would suggest that he perjured himself is absolutely without context, without substance, without basis, without intent, without proof, and it serves no purpose. It serves no purpose.

From all of that, and of course some time back the tragedy of Fast and Furious—and whenever I come to the floor I offer my deepest sympathy for the lost and for the family who suffered an enormous loss of their great and wonderful son. There is nothing that one can say to bring back their son.

I have no quarrel with getting to the facts. But again, in Fast and Furious, none of it pointed back, by independent arbiters. This had to do with the misdirected—probably with good intentions—but misdirected and cruel results of putting guns in the hands of thieves and crooks to be able to track guns and gun trafficking between the United States and Mexico. I will not defend it. I am not here to defend that. I was appalled. But I think we must have a reasonable discussion of truth. And the reasonable discussion of truth is: Did Mr. Holder have anything to do with the mishaps of Fast and Furious? I can assure you that they have yet to point to him on that basis.

Eric Holder came to the Department and he took up the challenge, in these words, of his mission, that his challenge would be protecting the security, rights, and interests of the American people. More than 4 years later, together with the extraordinary men and women who serve at the Department of Justice, that promise has been fulfilled for many of the accomplishments that this Department has achieved.

Now, my good friend was on the floor, my good friend—and he is, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. He has a passion for preventing, among other things, human trafficking. We work together on these issues.

Eric Holder has been a crusader to fight against the viciousness of human trafficking. He has, in fact, set up a task force in my own city of Houston, which, to our dismay, has been known as the epicenter of human trafficking of young people, prostitution, individuals coming up to the southern border. One of the most debasing parts of an existence is to be taken hostage—bondage—by someone else to be abused and mistreated. So he has been enormously committed, passionately committed to the idea of preventing human trafficking, and we look forward to working with him.

He wanted to save you money. And they've had a very successful reach on financial fraud, setting up a Consumer Protection Working Group consisting of Federal law enforcement regulatory agencies, making sure that those who attack the vulnerable with payday loans and the elderly know that the Justice Department is standing on their side. And the very ones that go after Active Duty military—how sad, young people coming home from far-away places and all of a sudden they are victimized, the resources that they have that are limited.

The lawsuit that was filed against mortgage fraud that took this country down, took homes away from those who deserved them, the billion dollar

lawsuit against Countrywide led by this Department of Justice.

Banking houses, various inappropriate behavior by some on Wall Street, General Holder was not afraid, on behalf of the American people. And countless banking officers who took money, such as some of those whose names include Carollo and Goldberg and Grimm, all former executives of General Electric, were sentenced related to bidding for contracts for the investment of municipal bond proceeds and other municipal finance contracts, which would undermine not only the public trust—remember, that's how it started—but it would also diminish the assets.

It was this Justice Department that continued the prosecution of the Madoff brothers, Peter Madoff, on June 29, 2012, one of the most—oh, my God, I would use the word “sad,” but that is certainly not a strong enough word, but I did use the word “tsunami”—one of the most catastrophic attacks on people who innocently invested with someone who they thought would maximize their savings for the good ol' days of their sunset years.

He continued to secure justice for victims of mortgage fraud. He worked on a number of issues regarding servicemembers. And, what I think was particularly important, what you wanted him to do, is he went after international cartels, domestic collusion conspiracies, price fixing, bid rigging, market and customer allocation. He was, along with his team, committed to serving the American people.

I see my colleague is here, and I just want to mention a few others before I yield to her. Because, as I mentioned, his passion for people's lives is so moving that I need to get this on the record.

The Department has charged a record number of human trafficking cases. I gave you the story, but I didn't give you the facts. Over the past 4 years, the Department has increased the number of human trafficking prosecutions by more than 30 percent in forced labor and adult sex trafficking cases, while also getting a number of convictions in the Innocence Lost National Initiative dealing with our children. So the Department has dismantled trafficking with Ukrainian victims held in Philadelphia in false labor; Central American women, convicting the traffickers who threatened and violently abused them to compel them into forced labor and forced prostitution in restaurants and bars on Long Island. Or, we restored the rights and freedom of the undocumented—I like to say “we” because this is close to my heart—of Eastern European victims, convicting the trafficker of brutally exploiting them in massage parlors in Chicago; a Florida man, his wife and a codefendant for actions involving sex trafficking of seven minor victims in a house in Fort Lauderdale; and secured a life sentence against a gang member in the Eastern District of Virginia for

sex trafficking of victims as young as 12 years old.

Eric Holder has not been sitting around trying to construct when he would come to Congress and perjure himself. That has not been his task and his challenge.

Let me just say this, as there is a lot that I want to engage in. I'll just throw this out before I yield. Our violent crime rates have yielded, maybe because we see someone like the old movies about the FBI G-Men, maybe we see the “H-Man” coming in Eric Holder, for he has prosecuted thousands of criminals with illegal gun possessions. That does you harm. That does your children harm.

□ 1320

I want to just say this to my distinguished colleague—as I yield to Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON—when the American people needed to have an unfettered voting system, yes, many disagreed. But Eric Holder and his team in the Civil Rights Division have not been overturned. They were following the law.

We do expect a Supreme Court decision in a matter of days on section 5. I cannot predict what that decision will be. But there were a number of decisions that had to do with ensuring that there was one person, one vote.

Remember I started by saying, whether we agree or disagree, there should be something called trust. Many people would say to me, one person's trust is another person's poison. But it's all about the law. This Justice Department has been following the law. It is crucial that when we use a litmus test to be able to determine whether someone should resign—and by the way, General Holder, do not resign, America needs a top law enforcement officer of integrity—then the standard should be the law, the standard should be the Constitution, the standard should be the facts, the standard should be case law on the Voting Rights Act and redistricting cases and election law. The majority of the cases—the infrastructure of the cases that have been upheld—have been led by Eric Holder, the Attorney General of the United States of America.

I would be privileged to yield some time to the distinguished scholar—and she happens to be a Congressperson of the great District of Columbia—ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. Thank you for your leadership and scholarship on constitutional issues.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady, first, for yielding and for her kind words. But I thank her even more for what she's done this afternoon. She has come to the floor—my good friend from Texas—and has rendered one of the most informative highlights of the career of this Attorney General since he has held the office.

I would like only a few minutes to say a few words about the Attorney General because he began when in the

Clinton administration I got the courtesy that's normally given to Senators—we have no Senators—so I got the courtesy of recommending to the President the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia and District Court judges. Although the District of Columbia has long had a large African American population, for most of its 200 years there have been no African American United States attorneys. Even though the United States attorney in the District of Columbia handles not only what he does for, for example, my good friend in Texas, that is Federal matters, but because there are some limits on our home rule, also handles all of the local criminal matters. Using a 17-member distinguished committee of citizens who vetted a great number of candidates and gave to me the top three, I chose the man who is now Attorney General as the first African American U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. He acquitted himself so well that he became an assistant Attorney General and finally Attorney General of the United States.

We are accustomed to seeing Attorneys General get in trouble. The last two Attorneys General were virtually chased out of office because of the mistakes they had made. I think that's because the Attorney General is close to the most controversial business of the President of the United States. I'm not surprised that the Attorney General would be a target. I am surprised that he would be accused so recklessly of, for example, perjury. I believe he will be vindicated shortly because it's so clear, on the face of this matter, that there has been not even a scintilla of an attempt to mislead the Congress or anybody else.

I think of Ambassador Susan Rice, who was yesterday appointed to be the National Security Advisor, the closest advisor to the President on foreign affairs, and of what she went through. She now has been thoroughly vindicated and yet she lost the possibility of being Secretary of State on the allegation that she had somehow misled the Congress in reporting on Benghazi.

Now, of course, the truth is out. All the emails are out. She wasn't part of any of the emails. She was the one who read the statement from the CIA. We now know that the statement was written by the CIA and that the State Department participated in writing it. The State Department was concerned that the State Department would be blamed for what was really a cover. The attack against the temporary U.S. compound in Benghazi was essentially a cover for a CIA operation. And so the CIA got into it. The State Department got into it. All of the intelligence officials got into it.

Together they issued a statement which now has been found not to have misled the Congress. If the joint statement didn't mislead the Congress, imagine the vindication now of Susan Rice, who only read a statement that she had no part in developing and had

no reason to believe—since it came from intelligence sources—that it was anything but the facts as they knew it. And indeed, it turns out they were the facts as they knew it.

I mention Ambassador Rice because of her recent appointment and because she stood accused in the same way that the Attorney General does.

Now, the gentlelady from Texas, my good friend Representative LEE, and I sit on two committees who have spent a lot of their time investigating the Attorney General. Please note that this is a Congress that has no agenda. Had it not been for these so-called scandals I'm not sure there would be anything to do in this House. They tend to go home early, to come late. There is nothing of much consequence on the floor. And indeed, I'm grateful for the appropriations period because at least there is something of substance to come to the floor.

If you don't come here to legislate, if you come here to malign, if you come here to keep the President from getting legislation, then you run out of ideas. We're now at the lowest deficit in 50 years, so they can't continue to talk about that the way you did before. They won't come to the table, as the American people have said they want, for a balanced deal. So we've got a floor where nothing happens and where people went home today—I think the last vote was around noon. There's nothing happening here.

Well, the vacuum has been filled by the committees, who have, each of them—there were five committees—looking into these various matters. Today, there was a Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on which I serve looking into the misuse of money by the IRS, except it turns out that was before this President's Executive order. The worst of the IRS misuse of funds during a travel session began in the last administration, much worse in that administration, and, by the way, in prior administrations. But it's now all over, long ended. But for House Committees, it's another way to go after the IRS.

All of us have been very critical of the IRS. We still don't know what really happened there. But without knowing it, there are some on my committee who are tracing it back to the President of the United States without a scintilla of evidence. That, 50 years ago, would have been called what it is—McCarthyism.

□ 1330

So, when the gentlelady comes to defend the Attorney General who has been attacked, I come simply to join her and to thank her.

In our committee, for example, we spent, perhaps, most of last year on the so-called "gunwalking," where there was the tragedy of a border security agent who was killed. Our committee over and over again asked for the full slate of witnesses. If we'd had those, then we would also have had the last

Attorney General from the Bush administration as well as his lieutenants because that's who started the gunwalking, and this Attorney General, of course, stopped it. Over and over again, they raked Attorney General Holder and his top lieutenants over with charges of perjury. Unable to prove them, they went so far as to try to subpoena documents that the President believed should not, in fact, become a part of the public record, so he invoked executive privilege. Why did he do that? Once he invoked executive privilege, then he, too, was accused of being part of a coverup.

Yet it is, in fact, the case—and here I'm going to quote—that the Supreme Court has said:

Human experience teaches that those who expect public dissemination of their remarks may well temper candor with concern for appearances. Thus, Presidents have repeatedly asserted executive privilege to protect confidential executive branch deliberative materials for congressional subpoenas.

Otherwise the President cannot expect to get the truth from his Attorney General or from others who report to him.

Then they said the President had asserted executive privilege too late, when they ran out of other excuses, except the reason that he asserted it when he did was he was hoping they would negotiate the matter. You don't come up with executive privilege when you think reasonable men and women will come to a reasonable conclusion.

The failure to look at the root causes of the gun walking tragedy involving two administrations, to call no official from the administration that was responsible for thinking of the idea of gunrunning in the first place and for carrying it on for some time does demonstrate a Congress engaged in fairness. If this Congress is not known for its fairness as a general matter, I'm not sure why, perhaps, we should expect that the high-profile Attorney General, who has become, as some of the press has reported, something of a proxy for the President of the United States, himself, would then get fairness.

The gentlelady mentioned the coconspirator matter. She and I are both attorneys. We are accustomed to indictments in which the prosecutor names a "coconspirator," never attempting to prosecute that person, but because the information has to allege precisely what happens, he will name a person. No person in the press has ever been, and there was never an attempt to prosecute anyone in the press. However, those involved are at a disadvantage: we cannot be told what they were going after because it is an intelligence and a secured matter. That leaves everyone here who is out for the Attorney General free to allege whatever he wants to, unless he has some sense of responsibility.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I am so glad that you raised that point, because we do not want to suggest that a layman's

ears are different from a lawyer's ears, but that is a very important point which you have made.

The frustration is that, on your committee, there are many lawyers. You have lawyers who are investigators, particularly on the majority side. They understand what that concept is, which is that, when you have an indictment, you list names, and those names may be listed as coconspirators. To take that and then translate it into a layman's interpretation—oh, this person is going to be prosecuted—and to then suggest that the Attorney General perjured himself in front of the Judiciary Committee, where he said outright, I have no thought of prosecuting a reporter, and that wouldn't even come to mind, and to take the FBI affidavit which listed—in 2010, by the way, and I think this is 2013—the gentleman, Mr. Rosen, as a coconspirator and that nothing has happened since then, it is almost, I believe, an unfair treatment, an unfair misrepresentation, an unfair mischaracterization for the American people. The Attorney General made it clear in his testimony before our committee, I have no interest, no desire, no knowledge of prosecuting a reporter.

I just want to add, in addition, that we've just introduced a House bill that is similar to the Senate bill that has judicial intervention now, a sort of ramped-up SHIELD Act, which indicates that you would have to go to the courts in certain circumstances to secure some of the information of the press; but there is this distortion as he was questioned on May 15, 2013, and in 3 years, Mr. Rosen has never been indicted, and he has never been prosecuted.

Ms. NORTON. I must say I thank the gentlelady from Texas for that clarification. Not only that, the Justice Department has issued a statement to the effect it has no intent and never has had any intent of prosecuting the coconspirator as is the case and as has been the case for 100 years of the listing of coconspirators.

Just a moment more on this important matter. You mentioned that my committee has a lot of lawyers, like you and me. Your committee is the Judiciary Committee. I surely would have expected more of it than the way they've gone at the Attorney General.

On this matter of the AP reporters, of the AP-Rosen matter, the Attorney General recused himself. I'm not sure why he recused himself, but I imagine it is because, if you're looking for a leak and if you're doing a thorough investigation, you look from the top to the bottom. So, once he'd been questioned just as a President could be questioned, then, of course, he did the right thing, if that's the reason, by recusing himself. But when it came to the Rosen matter, which is simply signing off on the prosecutorial information—a routine ceremonial matter—there was nothing contradictory about that and his statement that he had no knowledge of the prosecution. He had

recused himself. Having recused himself, he'd better not have any knowledge of it.

These are fine points we are making, and I'm afraid, for many in the public, they are fine points because, as the gentlelady says, most people are not trained as lawyers, and if they are, they don't want to hear lawyer talk; but these are really important questions if you want to accuse somebody of something.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Of perjury.

Ms. NORTON. Of something as serious as perjury—and a lawyer at that.

I thank the gentlelady for coming to the floor so that these accusations—these wild and reckless accusations—against the Attorney General have not gone unanswered.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I am so grateful for your leadership.

I am going to conclude, and have some further comments; but before you yield, I just want to pose a question to you, Congresswoman, because, if nothing else, we can both agree together so it won't look like one person is saying it.

For an officer of the court, for the highest ranking law officer of the United States, the American people need to understand that the charge of perjury is one of the most devastating charges. Forget about your career, because all of us who are barred, who are members of the bar, are officers of the court—of all courts. Some are able to practice in the Supreme Court, in various Federal courts and otherwise, and as an officer of the court, even in the representation of your client, perjury is the ultimate charge.

□ 1340

That is why I'm so baffled and felt compelled to come to the floor to raise the question of why lawyers on the Oversight Committee and lawyers on the Judiciary Committee would even offer a charge of perjury under the circumstances of what I have just defined.

Let me just say this. In a letter to the Judiciary Committee, the Attorney General said:

The Attorney General takes the disclosure of classified information by those who have committed to protecting it very seriously, especially as such disclosures can cause grave damage to our national security.

The Attorney General also has the utmost respect for the vital role the media plays in an open society.

Then it goes on to talk about his commitment to protecting these vital sources. Then it goes on to again restate this whole question of investigation versus prosecution. It says:

At the outset, it is important to note the difference between an investigation and a prosecution.

And it goes on to lay out probable cause again. That's lawyer talk.

But it is very clear that the General wants to lay out for the Members of Congress in an open way—by the way, I don't know if we could both stand up here and count how many side meet-

ings and staff meetings that they had with the Attorney General on the gun walkings, what we call Fast and Furious, and now the meetings and letters that are going back, the ongoing contempt charge issue that is going on. This Attorney General has made himself available.

The real question I just want to pose to you, as I yield for your answer, is what it means to be charged with perjury as an officer of the court. What General, what lawyer would take it lightly—though some generals have gone to jail for perjury—that has been proven in a court of law?

Ms. NORTON. And charged on the basis of some evidence.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. And some evidence.

In this instance, we have one line that was stated that, No, I will not prosecute, versus the fact of the signing of an affidavit that did not result in a prosecution.

Congresswoman?

Ms. NORTON. Your point about an officer of the court is something that most Americans may be unaware of.

Every piece of paper that a lawyer files before a court of any kind—it may seem perfunctory—is subject to perjury precisely because when you're admitted to the bar, you become an officer of the court. So you risk your professional life because you could be disbarred not only for committing perjury, but even for misstatements in an offering before a court. That's the high standard to which we, who are members of the bar, are held. And for that reason, it would be unseemly for any lawyer, much less the highest lawyer in the land, to risk perjury.

And I submit that not only has perjury not been committed; the word "perjury" should never have entered into this conversation without the slightest bit of evidence. That's what "reckless" means, and I thank the gentlelady for the question.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady for her knowledge, and I thank the gentlelady for laying out something that, as you said, non-lawyers would say, We're going too much. But I think they understand when you have a role as given to you by the bar license and a role that you would not play with lightly—but I think the other point is, as I told you, I didn't want to highlight Mr. Holder's tenure. But he's been around since 1976. Let me just say that he's had many times to disabuse this officer role, and he has not done so because of his integrity.

I'm glad you mentioned now National Security Adviser Rice and use that as an example. Let me congratulate her and use that as an example of a very fine public servant and outstanding diplomat. In this instance, there is not a morsel of evidence that she would manipulate the Benghazi talking points. What an enormous tragedy. Who would want to see our fallen diplomats lose their lives and their families? Let me just say this: We want the

truth, but we also juxtapose that as something to suggest that let us hold our words until we know what the facts are.

I just want to say very quickly that all of what you've heard us discuss is what has been absorbing the time of a place that should be talking about making right on the Affordable Care Act.

Now, I know that thousands in California are just getting rebates back because of the Affordable Care Act. I know that small businesses are getting dollars back because of the Affordable Care Act. I know that seniors are now getting preventive care because of the Affordable Care Act, children are getting preventive care, women are getting preventive care; but you're only hearing the bad news. Why? Because we're too busy making charges about perjury. I would rather you have the testimony. Let's have hearings to get people to come forward to tell America how the Affordable Care Act is making it better for them.

Let me tell you what else we're not taking any time to do because we're suggesting that the Attorney General—with no evidence whatsoever—is perjuring himself. In a couple of days, the parents of America, the children of America will be facing a 6.8 percent increase in the interest rates that our children will have to pay who are now coming out as 2013 graduates. But we're talking about General Holder, about whom I've given you a list. He has been a fighter against consumer fraud, human trafficking and crime, and there's been no evidence of perjury.

Instead of us meeting to have a compromise, to prevent the clock from ticking on July 1 and kicking up the interest rates—this is a nightmare. If you want to see a nightmare, go from \$4,174 to \$10,109. That was the bill that was passed by our Republican friends, and then the automatic increase is \$8,000. This is what our young people are going to be feeling the brunt of as they're trying to pay for college loans. Could we get together and work on that? I think we could.

Then, of course, we have heard dead silence about what we're going to do about reasonable gun legislation. I hope the lights of the Chamber don't turn off or the sound go out because it looks as if we're trying to take away guns. No. Every one of us holds up the banner of the Second Amendment. What we're saying is can we at least know who has them.

There are some who are putting forth mental health laws. I am a strong supporter of it. Let us help individuals who are suffering; but at the same time with regards to automatic weapons of any kind, there needs to be, minimally, closing the gun show loophole. And then those who are far more sophisticated than what these pictures may show, from my perspective, the kind that was used in Sandy Hook, we can do better as the American people.

Maybe we can also do something that we can all come together on. What

about a simple gun storage law, you know? We don't have it. And there is a series of children that have killed their siblings or their grandparents or their parents by having a gun lying around not locked, because there's no law, no requirement. Some States have it. We've done it and done a good job in bringing down that loss of life in Texas.

I'll be introducing legislation. I've been working with the General and the Department of Justice to ensure that we find a good balance. But there's a lot of work.

Sequestration is literally closing down teachers and child care units and cutting off civilians at military bases and stopping ICE enforcement officers and Customs and Border Protection and numbers of others are put on furlough because of sequestration.

Couldn't we get rid of H.R. 19? It says eliminate sequestration, go back to the budget or at least go to conference and treat the American people with respect so the services that you need are not shut down because of sequestration.

Why are we talking about perjury from the top legal officer where there has been no proven evidence that anything that he said in the Judiciary Committee was contradictory to what happened to Mr. Rosen? There's no proof. He recused himself. He's not involved. There's no indictment, no intention of indictment on the premise of what this particular issue was about, the leakage of national security matters.

□ 1350

And so my plea today is that we can do better. We can do better by our youngsters. In essence, we can stop the bleeding. We can do better by our children for health care. We can do better by better gun laws. We can do better by getting a better budget. We can do better by serving the American people. We can do better by building you new roads and bridges and infrastructure, fixings the dams, stopping the flooding.

All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, as I close, and I thank you, is to thank you, Mr. Holder, for your service. Do not resign. And to my colleagues, let's get to work to help the American people. I believe that will in fact be our finest hour.

I yield back the balance of my time.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*
Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism,
Homeland Security, and Investigations,
Committee on the Judiciary, House of Rep-
resentatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE AND CHAIRMAN SENSENBRENNER: This responds to your letter to the Attorney General, dated May 29, 2013, requesting information about the Department's policies with respect to investigations involving members of the media and the Attorney General's knowledge of an investigation into the unauthorized disclosure

of classified information that was then published in a news article in June 2009.

The Attorney General takes the unauthorized disclosure of classified information by those who have committed to protecting it very seriously, especially as such disclosures can cause grave damage to our national security. The Attorney General also has the utmost respect for the vital role the media plays in an open society. To ensure the proper balance of these important interests, the President has directed the Attorney General to conduct a review of Department policies regarding investigations involving the media, and as part of that process, the Attorney General has initiated a dialogue with news media representatives and other interested parties. Furthermore, as the Attorney General explained in the hearing before you on May 15, 2013, he supports the media shield legislation currently under consideration by the Senate, which provides robust judicial protection for journalists' confidential sources while also enabling the Department to continue to protect national security and enforce criminal laws. We look forward to working with Congress on this measure.

The Department's current policies provide separate processes for subpoenas and search warrants in the course of investigations involving members of the news media. As you know, 28 C.F.R. §50.10 governs the issuance of subpoenas to members of the news media, including subpoenas seeking their telephone toll records. This regulation requires the Department in every case to consider the balance between the public's interest in the flow of information and the public's interest in effective law enforcement and the fair administration of justice. Thus, the regulation requires the government to take all reasonable alternative investigative steps before considering issuing a subpoena to a member of the news media or for the telephone toll records of a member of the news media. This regulation has not been substantively amended in more than 30 years, and is a subject of the review process currently being undertaken by the Attorney General at the President's direction. Search warrants for materials in the possession of a journalist whose purpose is to disseminate information to the public are governed by the Privacy Protection Act of 1980, 42 U.S.C. §2000aa, et seq. That law outlines the limited circumstances under which the Department may seek Court approval for a search warrant. Specifically, under the Privacy Protection Act, the government may seek work product materials or documents in the possession of a journalist only where there is probable cause to believe that the journalist has committed or is committing a criminal offense to which the materials relate, including the crime of unlawfully disclosing national defense or classified information.

Your letter also asks for additional information about the investigation of the unauthorized disclosure of classified information to a reporter in 2009. At the outset, it is important to note the difference between an investigation and a prosecution. When the Department has initiated a criminal investigation in the unauthorized disclosure of classified information, the Department must, as it does in all criminal investigations, conduct a thorough investigation and follow the facts where they lead. Seeking a search warrant is part of an investigation of potential criminal activity, which typically comes before any final decision about prosecution. Probable cause sufficient to justify a search warrant for evidence of a crime is far different from a decision to bring charges for that crime;

probable cause is a significantly lower burden of proof than beyond a reasonable doubt, which is required to obtain a conviction on criminal charges. Prior to seeking charges in a matter, prosecutors evaluate the facts and the law and make decisions about who should be prosecuted. The regulation governing the issuance of subpoenas to the news media described above, which provides for consideration of the public's various interests, also requires that the Attorney General must approve any charges against a member of the news media. We are unaware of an instance when the Department has prosecuted a journalist for the mere publication of classified information.

The unauthorized disclosure of classified information that appeared in a June 2009 news article was a serious breach that compromised national security. The Federal Bureau of Investigation conducted a comprehensive inquiry into that unauthorized disclosure, and after exhausting all other reasonable options, the government applied for a search warrant for information in the reporter's email account believed to be related to the source of the unauthorized disclosure. The affidavit in support of the search warrant satisfied the requirements of the Privacy Protection Act, based on the facts alleged, and a federal judge granted that warrant. The Attorney General was consulted and approved the application for the search warrant during the course of the investigation. Ultimately, as you know, although a Grand Jury has charged a government employee with the unauthorized disclosure of classified information, prosecutors have not pursued charges against the reporter. At no time during the pendency of this matter—before or after seeking the search warrant—have prosecutors sought approval to bring criminal charges against the reporter. The Attorney General's testimony before the Committee on May 15, 2013, with respect to the Department's prosecutions of the unauthorized disclosure of classified information was accurate and consistent with these facts. As the Attorney General explained, these prosecutions focus on those who "break their oath and put the American people at risk, not reporters who gather this information."

We hope that this information is helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact this office if we may be of additional assistance in this or any other matter.

Sincerely,

PETER J. KADZIK

Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

EVENTS OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today is a very important day, the day of the anniversary of the invasion on D-day during World War II. There is also another important aspect about today, because we learned about the administration's collecting of massive information, private information, about every Verizon customer's phone numbers, all the calls they made, outside the country and within the country. Staggering. It makes one think,

well, gee, if this administration was gathering information and got a court order, a secret court order, to get all this information from Verizon, then most likely they did from the other carriers as well. And as a Verizon representative has pointed out, look, when we get a court order demanding that we turn over information, then we have to turn it over. And that is what we do in a country where we believe in the rule of law, we are supposed to follow the law.

But what is staggering for those of us who have debated over the FISA courts, where you have a real, legitimate, nominated and confirmed Federal judge, presides over information that is considered so secret that the disclosure of even the request for information would create dangers to national security. We've debated that in the Judiciary Committee. That included my friend, Ms. JACKSON LEE. We've had these debates over these issues.

I was talking with my friend with whom I often disagree in Judiciary, a Congressman from New York, JERRY NADLER, and actually I recall him indicating during debates that if we didn't rein in the power of the Federal Government, these were the types of things that could happen. And I have to admit today that for any predictions or concern on the part of JERRY NADLER that if we gave the power under article 215 or section 215—basically, the PATRIOT Act, the FISA courts—that it could and would be abused, Mr. NADLER was right. We are now seeing affirmation of that.

But I do think it is important that we understand what we're talking about with regard to these phone records, and as a preface I think it's important to look at the order from the United States Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, Washington, D.C. It's entitled, Mr. Speaker, In Re Application of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for an Order Requiring the Production of Tangible Things from Verizon Business Network Services, Inc. on behalf of MCI Communication Services, Inc. d/b/a Verizon Business Services. It cites for its authority in this the law at volume 50 of the United States Code, section 1861.

In this order that is granting the request of this Justice Department under this Attorney General, who is under fire for other issues, it says, "The court having found that the application of the Federal Bureau of Investigation"—which is under the auspices of the Attorney General, the Justice Department—"for an order requiring the production of tangible things from Verizon Business," et cetera, the court finds that it satisfies the requirements of 50 U.S.C., section 1861.

It goes on to say that accordingly, these things are ordered, and it orders, and I'm quoting now:

An electronic copy of the following tangible things: all call detail records or "telephony metadata" created by Verizon for

communications (i) between the United States and abroad; or (ii) wholly within the United States, including local telephone calls.

Further down, it says:

Telephony metadata includes comprehensive communications routing information, including but not limited to session identifying information (e.g., originating and terminating telephone number, International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI) number, International Mobile station Equipment Identity (IMEI) number), trunk identifier, telephone calling card numbers, and time and duration of call. Telephony metadata does not include the substantive content of any communication, as defined by 18 U.S.C., section 2510(8), or the name, address, or financial information of a subscriber or customer.

Now, this comes on the heels of information about just how invasive this administration had gotten when they went after the records of the Associated Press, the phone information of many, many phone numbers, and some of them coming from right up here in the area where the reporters use. This is in the United States Capitol. Many times these phones up here are used by reporters to call Members of Congress, who have another constitutional privilege under the Constitution that provides privilege for the information that is provided for or to a Member of Congress. It's not unlimited. But that's on top of the freedom of the press that's also granted in the Second Amendment.

It is amazing when our Attorney General said, gee, in essence, this was like the most egregious or one of the most egregious national security leaks I had ever heard about. It was so serious, we had to go after this material, and then we find out there were only a handful of people in the entire administration who knew the information that got leaked. And instead of just going without a warrant—they don't need a warrant to get their own administration phone call data. They didn't even need a court for that. It's their data. They could have gone to the handful of individuals that knew the information that got leaked and checked their phone logs to see who they called. But instead of doing that, they decide to go on a fishing expedition for all of this telephone information about the Associated Press.

□ 1400

They apparently wanted to know who the AP talks to, what they do, what they know, who they know. Let's get all of this information.

They didn't need that for their pursuit of the leaker. They didn't need it at all. They could have gone straight to their own sources and got what they needed from there; and then once they have a subject within the AP, if any one, then they could go for that information.

And as a former judge, if somebody came and said we have found the source of the leak, here's one of the five-or-so people that knew the information, he called this reporter at this

number, and so we have probable cause to believe that the leak was made to this reporter, and put other information in there that raises it to the level of probable cause to allow the judge to let them take a look at that one reporter's single phone logs.

But, no, they didn't do that. They went on an incredibly vast and very chilling fishing expedition.

And then we have the Attorney General testify before our Judiciary Committee, and I know my friends mentioned this before I got up, my friends on the other side of the aisle. They were talking about how he is such a great Attorney General, in essence, and certainly never perjured himself.

But I heard what he said. I've heard it replayed over and over; and when he says he wasn't aware of, he had not heard of, he never participated in—he didn't think it was a good idea was the basics of what he said—of ever prosecuting a reporter.

And then within a week or so we find out, actually, he approved of an affidavit that went before a judge with the request for a warrant from the court against James Rosen with Fox News.

Now, I've had people wake me up at all hours of the day and night. I've had people call when I was awakened at 2 or 3 in the morning and say, Judge, we need to come by your house. This is really serious. And they'd come by; and if they had enough data in their affidavits that established probable cause, then I would grant a limited warrant.

But there were times I would get upset with a law officer that bothered me with an affidavit and a request that clearly didn't have probable cause. We aren't going to grant that. If you're not sure if you have probable cause, talk to the DA's office, run it by them before you bring something in that clearly does not establish probable cause.

Fortunately, the law officers were so good that we normally dealt with that normally that was not a problem, but sometimes it was. And any responsible judge takes that very seriously.

And sometimes you would get a request for a warrant for information; and you go, okay, you've established probable cause in your affidavit, but your request is so global and broad, or so ambiguous, I can't sign the order you've prepared. Sometimes I would interlineate in the order and make it more specific. Sometimes they would know that I was going to be restrictive, and they would leave blanks for that.

But then to find out that the court granted this administration's demand, with an affidavit supporting it, under oath, that they needed all the records that Verizon had on phone calls inside the United States and to places outside the United States, and the judge just grants it.

And now, following on the heels of learning that the IRS targeted political enemies, political opponents, people in Tea Parties, people that were very pro-Israel, other groups, a group that was very pro-marriage between a

man and a woman, like has been the tradition in this country for the entire history of the country, until now, when it's come into question, and some think that nature totally failed when it created, biologically, a mating between a man and a woman, that it screwed up, it should have been a man and a man.

Well, that's a difference of opinion. But under this administration, they felt like it was worth going after and preventing a group like National Organization for Marriage from stepping up and standing on the traditional marriage and being able to deliver that message.

Now, it didn't prevent them from quickly granting legal status to groups that felt otherwise, or if somebody was related to somebody in the administration. We've seen those examples.

But, gee, they also knew within the IRS that if they granted or denied a request, well, a denial could be immediately appealed. And so in order to prevent justice from being done, prevent people from having the opportunity to politically express themselves as a group, they just sat on them, 1, 2, 3 years, to prevent them from being able to go public as a group.

I was shocked that a reporter asked the question, well, you groups, you were coming begging to the IRS. You're the ones that asked for legal status. And I'm sure this is a very fine reporter, but it just showed the ignorance—and there's nothing wrong. We're all ignorant of different areas—but showed the ignorance of where we have gotten to in this country where the Internal Revenue Code is so oppressive, if you, as an individual go out and say look, I don't have much money, I'm a working man, I'm just barely getting by. You're a working woman, you're just barely getting by, but if we pool our money, we might be able to express ourselves politically, maybe buy a commercial, or maybe send out flyers, or maybe buy a billboard, but something. If we pool together, maybe we can have an impact in politics on an issue like marriage.

And if you pool your money like that, and you don't have permission from the IRS, then they're going to come after you because you've got to have a legal status to do things like that now in America.

And it is further indication as to why this infernal Internal Revenue Code and the incredibly huge number of regulations that were never passed by any elected representative, they're just generated day after day after day by some bureaucrat somewhere, I used to say in a cubicle, but apparently we find out they've got some pretty luxurious offices and they spend millions on their conferences they go to.

Apparently they haven't spent enough on learning to line dance because I wasn't very impressed with their line dancing, but that's not part of their job, so maybe they need to get into a different area or a different profession.

But they have to obtain legal status if they're going to do anything politically, or the IRS can come after them for not doing so. So we have forced groups into getting government approval before they can ever express themselves politically. It's astounding.

And when you find out this administration has used so many aspects of its power to chill or prevent political opposition to their positions, to their reelection, then it really gets scary when you find out they're just out there wanting everybody's information on everybody they called in the country and out of the country.

And we had some pretty significant debates in Judiciary under FISA and under the PATRIOT Act; and we were assured, no, the law makes very clear you can only get information from an American citizen if they're in a foreign country and the foreign law allows that and they call a known or suspected terrorist.

But under these laws, we can't just go get information about an American citizen's personal records. We can't do that without probable cause they've committed a crime.

□ 1410

But under these incredible powers of the PATRIOT Act and the ability to go to the FISA court, as they did here, and get a secret order, we were told and we debated and some felt like even if an American citizen is in a foreign country, we don't think you ought to be able to get that American citizen's phone data, even if you just pull it out of the air. We don't think you should be able to get that.

So there was debate about those things. Well, what if they're calling a known terrorist, and we've got American intelligence agencies gathering in a foreign country and we can get that without a warrant? It's out there floating around in the air. We can get that. And this was debated—Yeah, but they're an American citizen. You ought to leave them alone. And some of us felt if they're an American citizen in a foreign country and our intelligence agencies can get intelligence data without violating the foreign law, then you need to know as an American citizen when you go into a foreign country, you may have our own intelligence agencies getting information about your telephone calls as long as they're not violating the law of the country they're in. And that's the way I felt.

But we were always assured that unless there was probable cause to believe an American citizen was calling a known or suspected terrorist or a hostile foreign government, that kind of thing, then no, we don't go after American citizens' information. And especially not if there's a call from an American citizen to another American citizen. That's none of our business, unless there's probable cause to believe a crime is being committed. Then we find out they have actually found a judge that signed off on this thing, and they got all this information.

Now I know there's some—even Republicans—who would say, Gee, I don't care if the government has my phone number. They've gotten it so they can go after terrorists. Well, unless you're a terrorist, the American government has no business monitoring what all you're doing and who you're calling, especially this administration, with all the abuses we've already seen. It's wrong. It should not be occurring. But they've done so.

There was a tweet today by Ace of Spades. The tweet was: We've all got an Obama phone now. Well, apparently we do. Because this administration is following every call being made by every phone in America—at least the ones on Verizon. So that leads you to believe they've probably gotten it from other information, too.

And I do appreciate my colleagues' on the other side concern that enough good things about ObamaCare are not coming out because some of us are concerned about the Attorney General's perjury. And I would submit, humbly, that a major reason not enough good things are coming out about ObamaCare is because there are not a bunch of good things coming out. People are losing their insurance. They're getting in trouble. And that is a big problem.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has approximately 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you.

This is the anniversary of D-Day. So many Americans died on the beaches at Normandy. So many free countries gave the last full measure of devotion there on those beaches. It wasn't Normandy but rather another beach where one of my constituents, who has since passed away, said that when they were landing at Anzio, they were doing it so early in the morning, there was no sunlight. But the Axis powers had such powerful lights that you could read a book in their landing craft. And they'd been taught that when the landing ramp went down when they got to shore, they were to all run out at the same time. And as they got closer, they heard the machine gun bullets going back and forth across the front of the ramp. He said, We were all so scared. We know when that ramp went down, we were all going to die.

And one of the guys—Paul Stanley recalled his name, I do not—but he exemplified the spirit of America. He finally looked around and said, Guys, we all know if we run out of this landing craft the way we've been trained, we're all dead. So here's what we're going to do. I'm going to go first. Everybody is going to put your weapon in your right hand and grab the belt of the man in front of you and we're going to run out single file. Some of us won't make it. But that way some of you have a chance.

Paul Stanley said he was third. The two in front of him were killed and everybody else made it. That's the spirit

of America that landed on the beaches of Normandy to take on the Axis powers who sought to take freedom from free people.

It was on this day in 1944 that Franklin Roosevelt said this prayer on national radio. Today, he would probably be excoriated because of some of the terminology.

He said:

My fellow Americans, last night, when I spoke with you about the fall of Rome, I knew at that moment that troops of the United States and our allies were crossing the Channel in another and greater operation. It has come to pass with success thus far. And so, in this poignant hour, I ask you to join with me in prayer.

Almighty God, our sons, pride of our Nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our Republic, our religion, and our civilization, and to set free a suffering humanity. Lead them straight and true; give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness in their faith.

They will need Thy blessings. Their road will be long and hard. For the enemy is strong. He may hurl back our forces. Success may not come with rushing speed, but we shall return again and again, and we know that by Thy grace, and by the righteousness of our cause, our sons will triumph. They will be sore tried, by night and day, without rest until the victory is won. The darkness will be rent by noise and flame. Men's souls will be shaken even with the violences of war.

For these men are lately drawn from the ways of peace. They fight not just for the lust of conquest. They fight to end conquest. They fight to liberate. They fight to let justice arise, and tolerance and good will among all Thy people. They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home. Some will never return. Embrace these, Father, and receive them, Thy heroic servants, into Thy kingdom.

And for us at home—fathers, mothers, children, wives, sisters, and brothers of brave men overseas—whose thoughts and prayers are ever with them, help us, almighty God, to rededicate ourselves in renewed faith in Thee in this great hour of great sacrifice.

Many people have urged that I call the Nation into a single day of special prayer. But because the road is long and the desire is great, I ask that our people devote themselves in a continuance of prayer. As we rise to each new day, and again when each day is spent, let words of prayer be on our lips, invoking Thy help in our efforts. Give us strength, too—strength in our daily tasks, to redouble the contributions we make in the physical and the material support of our Armed Forces. And let our hearts be stout, to wait out the long travail; to bear sorrows that may come, to impart our courage unto our sons wheresoever they may be.

And, O Lord, give us faith. Give us faith in Thee, faith in our sons, faith in each other, faith in our united crusade. Let not the keenness of our spirit ever be dulled. Let not the impacts of temporary events, of temporal matters of but fleeting moment, let not these deter us in our unconquerable purpose.

With Thy blessing, we shall prevail over the unholy forces of our enemy. Help us to conquer the apostles of greed and racial arrogances. Lead us to the saving of our country, and with our sister nations into a world unity that will spell a sure peace, a peace invulnerable to schemings of unworthy men. And a peace that will let all men live in freedom, reaping the just rewards of their honest toil.

Thy will be done, Almighty God. Amen.

Franklin Roosevelt, on this day in 1944.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1420

FRAGER'S FIRE/APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak a few minutes this afternoon on two subjects. The first involves both a wonderful evening for any Member of Congress and a tragedy in our Capitol Hill neighborhood nearby. The second involves the upcoming appropriations period.

Mr. Speaker, last night was a terrific evening if you happened to be there. Members of Congress—it looked like equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans; we are part of the so-called No Labels Caucus; these are Members of Congress who are trying to get beyond the needless polarization in this House—decided to go to the baseball game together, the Nationals Stadium, our new, terrific stadium here in the District of Columbia. It was a Nats-Mets game. I'm sorry to report the Nats lost badly. They also played the night before and won, if I may also report that.

I was coming back from this really wonderful bipartisan experience—we ate hot dogs together, we ate & drank together—me, wine, a lot of my colleagues beer—and we talked about anything but the House. We talked about what people have said Members need to do more. We talked about the game and what was happening in our lives.

I sat next to a Member I had never met before even though he's on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee with me. His name is RODNEY DAVIS. It was so funny to hear him talk about how I didn't know him, he said he was the lowest man on the totem pole. He apparently was, at least in seniority on our committee the last member and I'm near the top in seniority. We laughed about that. He laughed about how narrow was his margin in getting to the House. I mean, all of this was fun. And, yes, the game—the game, of course, was the baseball game.

He told me about his 12-year-old twin boys. That was really so touching—how he missed a suspension vote because he was coaching the baseball team where his boys played. So that was the setting of the evening. You can't help but feel good when you come home from an evening like that.

Because I have for many years lived on Capitol Hill—I represent the District, I am a native Washingtonian and I now live on Capitol Hill—I didn't have to go far from Nationals Stadium to come home. But I returned to find a pungent smell in the air because the

storied neighborhood hardware store, Frager's, was in the process of being burned to the ground. I could get only so far along Pennsylvania Avenue, then everyone had to take a detour. Even this morning, parts of Pennsylvania Avenue, Southeast were closed off because of, even then, hot spots from the fire. It was like losing a friend—a human friend, that is.

My first thought went to the employees; there are about 65 of them. I'm grateful to have learned that it appears no one was injured or hurt. This pungent odor—remember, this is a hardware store, so there's all kinds of things to go up in flames and all kinds of smells. And even though I'm a number of blocks—about six to ten blocks—I could smell the odor very deeply from the fire. In fact, the city announced that everyone should go in and turn on their air conditioning and not come out for a while.

The employees were still in the building—some of them—but got out of the way of the fire, and no one was injured or killed. I understand that there may have been a couple of firefighters who were injured. We certainly wish them the very best and thank them for fighting what was a horrendous, hot, and unusual fire in the middle of a wonderful residential neighborhood.

When a store that's been in the same location for 100 years goes up in flames, you begin to realize that it was more than a neighborhood hardware store, after all, and that after almost 100 years in the same location it had embedded itself into our Capitol Hill community as an institution all its own. It stirred in me something like the emotion that I felt when the Eastern Market—our historic, old market that was even older than Frager's—went up in flames a few years ago. Those are parts of your neighborhood we cannot imagine being without.

We have since rebuilt Eastern Market so that it looks very much like it always did—because it's a historic building and great pains were taken to see to it. Now, I'm not yet sure they will be able to do that at Frager's. After all, the Eastern Market is a publicly owned market. That's not the case with this private business, which has thrived in our neighborhood through the era of mega-hardware stores. Frager's had survived when the era of the corner grocery and the corner store of every variety seem to have gone by the way.

It says everything about Frager's that it could survive in that kind of competition, where these multipurpose mega-hardware stores are accessible if you want to get in your car. I guess that may be the key to why the best of these corner institutions have survived for so long.

Frager's was not a state-of-the-art building. That's part of the reason it could burn down. You go in and they have squeezed goods into Frager's that you will not find at our wonderful mega-hardware stores. There are

things that may have gone out of style, but they're just what you need and they're just what goes best with your own home.

Capitol Hill is a historic district. I live in a historic house. You can't do anything to the outside of the house; you can change it on the inside. So you can imagine, we're always trying to match up the historic eccentricity of our homes with what's available in the stores. Well, Frager's is always there to help you. So the loss is, for us, monumental.

I think Frager's has survived all these years not only because it happens to often have what we can't find anywhere else, but particularly because of the service ethic that is a part of this neighborhood institution. You go to Frager's, they know you if you've been in there once before. They go out of their way to help you even as you try to find your way through the cramped aisles. They have the amenities you need. You may still go to the big megastore, but very often you'll try Frager's first—or have to go to Frager's when you didn't find it where you might have thought it should have been.

Above all, such stores in our neighborhoods are tailored to our needs. They've learned what people ask for, and they try to stock it when no one else would.

It made me recall Frager's 90th anniversary—about 3 years ago. I was so impressed that the neighborhood had a store that is where it was 90 years ago—and now we are at 93 or so—that could still celebrate that it's there and has been there all that time. So I came to the floor on that occasion and have since put those congratulatory remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

So I was really very much looking for another opportunity today to salute Frager's and to say to Frager's that yes, we know you are different from the Eastern Market. Yes, you have insurance, and you don't have taxpayer dollars to help you build. But I think you will find a very grateful neighborhood doing all it can to help Frager's survive, even as the Eastern Market historic market has survived, because there are certain institutions that are endemic to the neighborhood; and if they go, it simply will not be the same neighborhood.

□ 1430

The morning after you still couldn't get close to Frager's. I'm going to go by this evening and I'm going to try to find John Weintraub, who is the owner. This store is located at 11th and Pennsylvania Avenues, Southeast. The cause of the fire is still not known, or at least was not as of this morning.

John Weintraub bought this store, bought Frager's, from the Frager family in 1975. So that tells you that a very good part of its existence one family owned Fragers. John Weintraub has moved it seamlessly from the original family to Mr. Weintraub. He's hoping that his insurance takes care not only

of the building, but somehow helps him with the salaries of his 65 employees. I'm very pleased that by the time I awakened this morning, the Matchbox, another store in our neighborhood, had announced that it would offer temporary work to Frager's employees until they are able to find employment.

I was also very pleased to read that the nursery, which was my favorite spot at Frager's, was somehow intact. Beside the hardware store, which is a remnant of its former self now, was a large nursery, an outdoor nursery, with just the kind of flowers you need to start up your window box in the spring with all the plants. You could go and shop for all plants in the outdoors section of Frager's there. Somehow, that section had survived most of the fire. And I hope that we're going to be able to go very soon, notwithstanding the destruction of the building, to the nursery, to remind everybody that Frager's is alive, well, and thriving despite the fire.

I want also to salute those who stood with Mayor Vincent Gray and me just about 10 days ago to announce that as the District of Columbia appropriation comes to the floor, we will be looking at the appropriators to make sure that they respect the District of Columbia's 600,000-plus American citizens and the District of Columbia as the independent jurisdiction it is and will refrain from directing our city on how to spend our own local funds.

Standing with us at a press conference were representatives from a number of organizations: DC Vote, the extraordinary organization that leads the fight for district voting rights for our ability to spend our own money, and for our right to be treated as other Americans are treated. Also there were the groups who are targeted the way that we have been targeted. There were the gun safety groups. There were the pro-choice groups. There were the health groups.

The groups include Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, AIDS United, DC Vote, Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, NARAL Pro-Choice America, the Center for Reproductive Rights, the National Abortion Federation, the Reproductive Health Technologies Project, the Black Women's Health Imperative, the Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, and the Center for American Progress.

They said they would alert their members should the District's appropriation be targeted for what we call riders, which are undemocratic attachments to the D.C. appropriation to keep it from spending its own local funds in a democratic manner, as directed by its citizens. This, of course, would never be the case for any other jurisdiction. But because the Congress has retained some jurisdiction over the District, there are Members of this body who would take advantage of its jurisdiction to intrude into the local affairs of a local jurisdiction.

Yet, in 1972, the Congress itself recognized that this was wrong. On the

heels of the civil rights movement, interestingly, it delegated the authority for governance to the District of Columbia itself. It was about time. It had been done so once before in the 19th century when the Republicans, after the Civil War, allowed the District to have representation in Congress and a home rule government.

However, the Democrats came back to power and abolished local government and the right to be represented in the Congress. We still do not have the vote on the House floor; although we pay taxes at very high rates like every other Member's constituents. But at least there was some representation.

Finally, in the mid '70s, the Congress saw how wrong it was to claim itself to be the leader of freedom around the world and yet have its own capital city with no local governance and no representation in the Congress of the United States. However, when it delegated its authority to the District for local governance, it did leave four or five exceptions.

The exceptions were, for example, that the Districts can't tax the Federal property located in the District of Columbia. And the other exceptions were of that kind. Congress didn't add; and Members may at any time they have a preference keep the District from spending its own local funds the way their own constituents can spend their own local funds.

We will never give up our full rights as American citizens to spend our own funds. We raise \$6 billion more than some States every year. When our folks tell us how to spend that money, we're going to always fight to spend it, just as every Member would fight to spend it as democratically directed by constituents.

We had thought when the Republicans—particularly the Tea Party Republicans as they call themselves—came they would be the first to side with us on this matter because they are supposed to, according to their recited principles, resent the intrusion of Federal power, sometimes even where Federal power always has been. So we thought they would be the first to understand that you don't use the big foot of the Federal Government against any local jurisdiction and then somehow claim the Constitution because the District does not have statehood yet. Not a matter of principle.

I appreciate how the appropriators have handled our appropriation for the last several years. When the Democrats were in charge of this body, we were able to get all of the riders off of our appropriation, and only one has come back, an abortion rider, and we intend to get that one off again. But the others have not come back. And I want to express my appreciation to this House for at least keeping those attachments off.

One of them was an attachment that cost lives and has left us with people who are ill. That attachment kept us from spending our own local money on

needle exchange programs, which are widely used around the world and throughout the United States. States can't spend Federal funds for needle exchange programs, but they can spend local funds. Every large city; and many counties spend their own local funds this way because it is one of the few proven ways to keep HIV/AIDS from spreading.

The District was kept from spending its own local funds on needle exchange programs for 10 years. The result was that the District had the highest AIDS rate in the United States for that reason. Right down the road, Baltimore, a much poorer city than the District of Columbia—and the District of Columbia is not a poor city. It is a city of—yes, it is a modicum of poor people, but it is a very prosperous city.

□ 1440

Down the road in Baltimore, you have had for years a better AIDS rate than you have had in the District of Columbia because nobody could keep Baltimore from using needle exchange programs. These are programs that, for example, when an addict is on the street, allow the one city to wean him from addiction or at least keep him from passing a dirty needle on that will spread the virus, but it is often to wean him from drugs because he expects and wants the clean needles to come every day. It is a highly effective way. Whatever it is, we have the right to save the lives of our own people the way we define if that way is legal and constitutional.

You can imagine the anguish we felt when we could not even save the lives of our own people. To its credit and the credit of this House, that rider has not come back on our appropriation. I had a meeting with Chairman ANDER CRENSHAW just yesterday. I don't have any idea what will happen, but he seems a fair and open man. I was pleased also to bring the Mayor to have a meeting with him so that he could meet the chief executive of the city. There also are other riders that were on the appropriation that are not now on it.

We've learned to take the offensive, though, because we are left here by ourselves—a delegation of one—so it's real easy to gang up on us because I'm all the District has. It has no Senators, and therefore we try to stop such intrusions before they occur. Yes, partly, perhaps, because of that—because of the action of our allies in writing the appropriators, having their constituents contact appropriators—this may have had an effect; but I think what has also had an effect is there are Members who, I think, listened to the effect of these riders, and who have seen them as inconsistent with the principle of local control and have acted accordingly.

So I say to those Members: you have our thanks and our appreciation.

I say to my own Capitol Hill neighborhood as I close: that we have lived through the tragedy of the loss of a

major public institution, the Eastern Market. We saw it come back. As Capitol Hill residents, it seems to me all of us have an obligation to help Frager's come back, too. Frager's has been there when we needed Frager's. Frager's cannot depend upon public money. Frager's needs support—and we'll have to learn what kind of support it is—from all of us if we value such unique neighborhood institutions.

At a time when our country is growing larger, when it is becoming so easy to become anonymous—when the personal and the ability to touch and feel that you are heard often seem so distant, when even those of us who Tweet and Facebook recognize that, at the same time, we are keeping our distance—at a time like this when Frager's brought us close, when Frager's made us walk to the store instead of getting into our cars, and when we found there, what we could not find elsewhere, let us celebrate this institution, with which, I think, every Member of the House from whatever community, large or small, could identify.

I celebrate Frager's. I look forward to its return in a fashion that will remind us of a near century's service to those who have lived in the Capitol Hill community, one of the oldest communities in the Nation's Capital.

I yield back the balance of my time.

RUMPELSTILTSKIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I appreciate the privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I come to this floor to voice my concerns about the direction some in the executive and legislative bodies seem to be going.

I will start it out this way, Mr. Speaker, in that, yesterday, it finally occurred to me how to describe the political whiplash that has taken place that goes against the logic and history and experience of myself and, I think, of a majority of the American people. I said to them yesterday in an immigration meeting inside the Republican Study Committee, which had a panel there of House and Senate to talk about immigration—some of them experts—that I feel like Rumpelstiltskin.

The story of "Rumpelstiltskin" is that he went to sleep under a tree, and he was clean shaven, and when he woke up, he had this long, long beard that had apparently grown over a century or so. The culture shock that he got after having taken a little nap was what the narrative of the story of "Rumpelstiltskin" was about.

I went to bed the night of November 6 in having finished the election celebration, in having succeeded in another

election, but I watched as Mitt Romney had to concede that he had not won the Presidency from Barack Obama. I understood what that election was about as much as most anybody in this country.

It starts in Iowa. We spent nearly 4 years sorting out and helping to contribute to the knowledge base of the American people as to what the planks in the platform would be, what the platform would look like, how we would select a nominee for the President of the United States. It starts in Iowa with the first-in-the-Nation's caucuses, and of the candidates who come there, many of them will go to all 99 counties. Rick Santorum, for example, had over 380 meetings in Iowa, and he went to all 99 counties. MICHELE BACHMANN went to all 99 counties.

That's an endorsement from the Iowa caucuses that can be earned. You don't have to have millions of dollars to shape a media image and buy a nomination, but it is important to be there and talk. So we do this. We're all politics all the time. I'm engaged in the Republican Presidential nominating process from early on, so I watch this and I contribute to it. I weigh in on the things that I believe in, and I've listened as every Presidential candidate has endorsed—let me just say this—my immigration ideas.

Yet, as I listened to the debate and as Mitt Romney won the nomination and as he and Barack Obama had their multiple debates—three debates, if I remember, and there was much debate that went on throughout the media—I don't think anyone went to the polls on November 6 thinking this election is about immigration. I went to bed the night of November 6 in having realized that Barack Obama would be President for another 4 years. It was a disappointment to me and a crushing disappointment to many of us who had so many big plans on what we were going to do to put this Nation back on the right track with a new Republican majority anticipated in the United States Senate and a President Mitt Romney. It didn't work out that way, but I never believed on that night that the election was decided on immigration, Mr. Speaker. It was not. The debate was almost exclusively about jobs and the economy, jobs and the economy, jobs and the economy. It was drilled so relentlessly and so often that it put the American people to sleep. I said before the election multiple times that this needs to be more than a race about jobs and the economy. Nevertheless, that seemed to be what the polsters on the Republican side were advising Mitt Romney that needed to be continually coming out.

So the American people went to the polls doing what they do: they make decisions based upon what they hear people talking about. You can track polling, and I have looked at it for years. The polling that is going to have the highest priority of the people's concerns is going to be the one the people

are talking about, the one the media is talking about. National conversations are many times driven through the media. These conversations of a Presidential election were about jobs and the economy.

I went to bed disappointed that night on November 6, perhaps even crushed, at the loss of opportunity that this Nation would have. I woke up the next morning—not with a beard that was 100 years long, but just a normal one from a night's sleep—not thinking that there was anything except jobs and the economy and the promise of the President to expand the dependency class and telling people, You're going to have less personal responsibility under Barack Obama, and you'll have more risk under Mitt Romney.

□ 1450

That was part of the argument: jobs in the economy, grow the dependency class. That was the argument.

But when I woke up on the morning of November 7, I began to see some of these things come through the news, this analysis that Mitt Romney would be President-elect on November 7 if he just hadn't said "self-deport," or Mitt Romney would be President-elect on November 7 if he hadn't lost such a large percentage of the Hispanic vote. Then the numbers began to trickle in a little bit, and you get those numbers that show—and I don't dispute them—that Mitt Romney got about 27 percent of the Hispanic vote and Barack Obama got about 71 percent of the Hispanic vote.

So the people who had promised that Mitt Romney was going to win the Presidency, including pundits who hung in until the polls were closed until the last minute, still insisting that there were precincts coming in in Ohio that were going to turn the election needed a scapegoat. They needed a scapegoat to blame the election loss on because they had predicted that victory and contributed to the engineering of the campaign and had pushed the jobs and the economy argument to the detriment of some of the other topics that would have been useful to get a better turnout among conservatives.

So in looking for a scapegoat, they began to say on November 7, Mitt Romney would be President if he hadn't said these two words: self-deport. He would be President if he had a larger percentage of the Hispanic vote. He lost too much of it. This is the mantra that we saw that came out of George W. Bush's campaign when he began to advocate for comprehensive immigration reform.

I remember a document that was produced by the Republican National Committee chairman. It was referred to as an autopsy or postmortem report. It said again that Mitt Romney would be President if he had gotten a larger percentage of the Hispanic vote and that George W. Bush got 44 percent of the Hispanic vote in 2004.

That number has floated out there since the day after that election in

2004; but it's not true, Mr. Speaker. George W. Bush never got 44 percent of the Hispanic vote. That number is someplace between 38 percent and 40 percent. It was a stronger percentage than Mitt Romney got, but Mitt Romney was competitive with JOHN MCCAIN's vote on the Hispanic side, and it was clear that JOHN MCCAIN has been an open-borders Senator all of his life. The only time he ever really was for border security and border control was when he had to save himself from a primary, and that's when he said build the "blank" fence.

So what we have here is an irrational conclusion drawn on the morning of November 7 of last year that turns out to be a handy little scapegoat, excuse, change the subject matter for people who made predictions that didn't match what the professional opinion was. Another thing that takes place is if you repeat something often enough in the news media, you can convince people that that is the topic, that was the subject.

So I will just tell you in this conference, people are now starting to understand the election wasn't about immigration, and there is no mandate for Barack Obama to sign an amnesty bill. There is a strong desire on the part of people that are for open borders to pass one. I understand why Democrats are for open borders and amnesty. They're the political beneficiaries of open borders and amnesty.

Republicans are paying the price for this wedge that's being driven between the Republican Party, Mr. Speaker. And in political tactics, as well as warfare and military tactics, if you can split the line of your enemy, your opposition, your competition, if you can divide them, especially if you can pit them against each other, you have a much greater chance of success.

This is a classical example of Republicans accepting an argument and, in fact, creating the argument, some of them joining with Democrats who gleefully drive the wedge in between the Republican Party to separate the rule of law, border security, pillar of American exceptionalism, constitutional conservative Republicans away from the establishment wing of the party that sees this world a little bit different.

Conventional wisdom here is Romney would be President if Republicans had done a better job reaching out to the Hispanic community. I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, that's not true. There's no data that supports that theory. Even still, they insist on adhering to this. And when I ask them what is in this Gang of Eight's bill in the United States Senate that has passed out of committee now to be considered on the floor of the United States Senate, what's in that bill for Americans, the answer is: nothing. There is nothing in that bill for Americans.

What's in that bill, then, for, let's say, Republicans? Well, political disaster is in it. There's nothing on the upside of it for Republicans.

What's in it for Democrats? Millions of new voters, more political power, a continued expanding of the dependency class, an erosion of the individual responsibility and the God-given liberty and freedom that this country has; and that's the benefit to the Democratic side of this thing, Mr. Speaker.

Then what is the effect? The effect is pretty clear. You have a study done by the stellar Robert Rector of The Heritage Foundation who does multiple studies. He is the most accomplished analyst that I know on this Hill, and his work has been subject to public scrutiny for more than two decades and his work has been unassailable.

When it was announced that he was doing an analysis of the economic impact of a Senate version of the bill, the amnesty bill, immediately his political opposition began to attack him personally and to attack a study they had never read. I know they never read it, Mr. Speaker, because it wasn't out and it wasn't released. And I got a verbal preview of that when Robert Rector came to speak before the Conservative Opportunity Society, which I've chaired for some years. And I knew they hadn't read the report because it wasn't released. I would get access to one of the first copies.

I have read every page of the Rector report. I believe it's 102 pages. There's a 5-page executive summary. This report boils down this, Mr. Speaker: if you pass the Senate Gang of Eight's comprehensive immigration reform/amnesty act, the net cost of the people who would be legalized in America, even if you use the 11.3 million, which I think is a very low estimate, the net cost to the taxpayer when you calculate the drawdown from the welfare systems and the health care and the education and the infrastructure—he's got it all broken down in detail—the net cost—and then you subtract from that the net tax contributions made by this group of people, you end up with a \$6.3 trillion price tag to the Senate's amnesty bill.

And still, Republican members of the Gangs of Eight, House and Senate, posture themselves as conservatives. They posture themselves as conservatives, and they advocate for a \$6.3 trillion net cost, and their best argument against the Rector report is that it's not dynamically scored.

I heard that yesterday from the gentleman from Idaho: the Rector report is not dynamically scored. If you dynamically score it, then presumably you could get around to a purist libertarian view that anytime—and that's this: anytime anybody does an hour's worth of work and contributes a dollar to the gross domestic product, they contribute to the economy. That's their theory. That's a very narrow view of what goes on in any country.

If you're going to call it economic growth because the GDP goes up by a dollar, but it costs you \$2 or \$3 on the other end out of tax recipients to fund the stimulation to get that extra dollar, that's not economic growth. But

they argue that it is. If you dynamically score the Rector report, it gets more costly, not less costly. The number of \$6.3 trillion in cost goes up, not down.

I would suggest that these people who are attacking Robert Rector or the Heritage Foundation or the people that are making allegations that the Rector report is not dynamically scored go in there and dynamically score the Rector report then. Tell me, what is your number? It's not good enough just to criticize somebody else's data without actually addressing the data. What's your number, Gang of Eight? How much do you think the Gang of Eight bills are going to cost the taxpayers for the people who would be legalized instantly? How much?

Then they say, I want more legal immigration, more legal immigration. You could ask them, How many are coming in here legally now? Most of them who make such a statement would be stumped, Mr. Speaker. They don't know.

If you don't know how many people are coming in here legally, say, over the last decade, how can you assert whether there should be more or less? And if they do know the number, then I would say to them: you think there should be more legal immigration? How many is enough? How many is too many? There are two more stumping questions I've just asked.

□ 1500

They don't know how many is enough. They don't know how many is too many. They're making a political calculation, not a policy analysis. It's not good enough to change the destiny of the United States of America simply by wetting your finger and putting it into the air, or checking your political barometer and making a decision whether it's a plus or a minus for you politically. Can you get reelected if you're for amnesty or not? That's some of the questioning that's going on around this body. I suggest we have a higher charge and a higher challenge and a bigger responsibility.

This is a constitutional Republic, and one of the essential pillars of American exceptionalism is the rule of law. This shining city on the hill sits on these pillars of American exceptionalism. And among them, many of them are in the Bill of Rights—freedom of speech, religion, the press, peaceably assemble, and petition the government for redress grievance. Second Amendment rights—the right to be secure in our persons, the property rights that used to exist before the Kelo decision. That is a little editorial, Mr. Speaker. I'll take that up in another Special Order sometime—the rights that devolve to the States or the people respectively under the 9th and 10th Amendments; no double jeopardy. All of those things.

If you take any piece that I've mentioned out of the history of this country, you don't get the United States of America. You can't be the United

States of America without the law, without the rule of law.

Millions of people come to this country to escape lawlessness, and we owe it to them as well as the heritage of all Americans to ensure that we do not have lawlessness institutionalized in this country.

Amnesty is. To grant amnesty is to pardon immigration law breakers and reward them with the objective of their crime. That's what's advocated by the Gangs of Eight, no matter how they want to spin it. If they do that, they will have provided an amnesty plan that can never be reversed, and they will have destroyed the rule of law at least with regard to immigration so that it can never be restored, destroyed so it could never be restored. There is no going back to this, going back to what was if this legislation passes.

And, I'll take us back to 1986. Ronald Reagan signed—he was honest with us, he signed the Amnesty Act, Mr. Speaker. He was pressured, no doubt. I'll just say I know that. He was pressured by a lot of people who have good judgment almost all of the time, good advisers, but the pressure that came was this: there are a million people in America. It started out at about 750,000; but by the time the decision was made by Ronald Reagan, they said there are a million people in America who are here illegally, and we can't deal with all of them so we want to get a fresh start. We can make this deal with the Democrats in Congress that if you just sign, Mr. President Reagan, the Amnesty Act, we will ensure also in that bill that there will be border security. Shut off the bleeding at the border, and the trade-off will be that we'll give amnesty to a million people.

And Ronald Reagan, with his compassionate heart and his good principles and good judgment, didn't see what was coming. What was coming was the intentional undermining of the enforcement. Democrats never intended to enforce immigration law in 1986. Ronald Reagan accepted their word. His word was good. He didn't have a reason to believe theirs was not. It was not. It was intentionally not good. But President Reagan signed the Amnesty Act for the purposes of the one sole and only Amnesty Act that was ever going to take place in the history of the United States. That was the promise.

And in exchange, we all had to fill out the I-9 forms with precision and fear that the Federal Government would come in and catch us in a technicality and lock us up in jail or fine us a great deal. I still have I-9 forms that are in the dusty files from back then. I was sure the INS was going to show up and take enforcement against me. It didn't happen in my company, or in thousands of companies across the country. They didn't enforce it the way it was promised to be enforced. We got the amnesty all right, but we didn't get the border security.

Now we have people that seem to have the wisdom as if they have been

born since then and denied access to the history books, and they seem to think that they can write laws that are immigration laws today that will put this thing away and finish adapting to immigration law for all time. They're saying, just listen to us, pass our Gang of Eight amnesty bill, and we will fix the immigration problem for all time.

It's clear to me that the lesson from 1986 didn't soak into them. They don't have a lot of gray hair. You don't have to pull out a history book and read it. In fact, just down the street just about any respectful Member of Congress could, I believe, get a meeting with Attorney General Ed Meese, who was Ronald Reagan's Attorney General in 1986, whom I believe advised Ronald Reagan to sign the Amnesty Act. But Attorney General Meese, whom I greatly respect for his intellect, for his character, for his judgment, for his work ethic, he's still in the game, wrote an op-ed in 2006 to deal with George W. Bush's amnesty proposal, and that op-ed say Reagan would not make this mistake again. And then now some 2 weeks ago or so, he released another statement that mirrors the 2006 statement.

So they could have the benefit of Attorney General Ed Meese and listen to what happened in 1986, if these Members were sincere about making an objective decision. They are not. They are salivating over putting their imprimatur on history and changing the character and the culture and the direction of the civilization of America.

Now, America has always been about assimilation. And we are, yes, a Nation of immigrants. So is every other nation on the planet, by the way, so we should not overemphasize that. We're a Nation of people that come together, that have assimilated different cultures and civilizations, and we have something I call American vigor.

American vigor comes from, these pillars of American exceptionalism that I listed, most of them in the Bill of Rights. You add to that free enterprise capitalism, you add to that the faith of Judeo-Christianity and Western Civilization all wrapped up together on this continent with essentially unlimited natural resources, the rule of law, manifest destiny. All of that was a magnet that attracted the vigor of every civilization here.

We didn't just get a cross-section of people that came from Asia or Europe or South America that came to America. We got the dreamers, the doers, the vigorous people from every donor civilization on the planet. The people that came to work and contributed that had ideas. They wanted to be unfettered by the ropes and chains and the restraints that their own home country had and came to America to embrace the American Dream. That's why we are America. That's why we have a can-do spirit. We got the best of the spirits of every single country on the planet. We must preserve these pillars of American exceptionalism, including the rule of law, or this Nation

will never reach its God-given and intended destiny.

That's why I stand so strongly on preserving respect and adherence to the rule of law. That's why I reject the President's lawless activities to suspend immigration law that he doesn't like and advance his political foundation in doing so.

The President has suspended immigration law by executive amnesty, is what he has done. That's what the debate was about last night with the King amendment. That's what the vote was about this morning with the King amendment that passed with strong support in a bipartisan way. Some people I think took a walk. But in any case, my amendment said they'll not use any of the funds appropriated in the bill to enforce the Morton memos, which are the memos commonly referred to that come from the President's wish to grant amnesty by executive edict.

And in one of those memos, the most famous of which, which established Dream Act Light, the President of the United States went out and did a press conference within 2 hours of the issuing of the memo that came from Janet Napolitano's office. And it says in that memo seven different times that we'll apply this on an individual basis only, on an individual basis only. I can repeat that five more times. That gives you a sense of what they put in the memo.

They know that when you litigate something like this, the individual basis only is the reference to prosecutorial discretion. The executive branch has the prosecutorial discretion. It's well established. I agree with it. They can't enforce every single law, but the law also requires that when ICE encounters an individual that they believe to be unlawfully in the United States, they are obligated to place them into deportation proceedings. That's the law.

The President suspended this specific law. He created four classes of people under the Morton memos and then has suspended the law as being applied against these four classes of people.

□ 1510

He's not doing it on an individual basis, only it's lip service on an individual basis only.

And of 450,000 people that had already been adjudicated for deportation, they have now waived that on 300,000 and they're grinding through the rest. It looks like they're on their way to nearly half a million people that get administrative amnesty, and this is before the "Dream Act Lite" memo came out. That's another chunk of this.

So the President has, time after time, through the actions of his execu-

tives, defied his oath of office, which is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That's the President's obligation. It's his oath to the Constitution. He had his hand on the Bible when he gave that oath. And he gave an oath to our Constitution.

He gave a lecture to some students out here at a high school on March 28, year before last I believe it was. And they asked him, why don't you just pass an executive order, sign an executive order to grant lawful status to the Dream Act kids?

And the President said, as a former adjunct constitutional law professor at the University of Chicago, accurately, he said, I don't have the authority to do that. The legislature passes the laws. My job is to carry them out. And the judicial branch is to pass judgment on the meaning of the technicality of the law. Pretty good response for a constitutional law adjunct professor.

And about a year later, the President decided he wasn't bound by his oath of the Constitution. Neither was he bound by the analysis or the opinion that he gave the high school kids; defied his oath, and he defied his own judgment, publicly stated, and granted administrative amnesty through a whole series of six different memos known as the Morton memos.

We cannot be a civilized country if we're going to have a President who legislates by executive edict, or by press conference, by the way.

Mr. Speaker, you'll remember that ObamaCare was not supposed to fund abortion, nor was it supposed to fund contraceptives or sterilizations. There was an accommodation that was made in an amendment here and some negotiations with the President.

But they do it anyway. They impose this on our faith communities as well. And our churches filed multiple lawsuits, more than I can actually quote into this RECORD today, to object on the grounds of religious liberty.

This country shall not impose a violation of religious liberty on our faith people, and it shall not draw a distinction between an individual's faith, a private sector business' faith, or a church itself. It's all the same. No one is exempt from the protection of our First Amendment rights.

Yet, this administration goes after them. And when he heard the heat that came back from the churches and, particularly, the Roman Catholic Church, the President did a press conference at noon on a Friday, and he said, I'm going to make an accommodation to the religious institution, an accommodation. Now I'm going to require the insurance companies to provide these things for free, abortifacients, contraceptives, sterilizations, and he repeated himself, "for free."

The President can't do that. Even if the rule further defines the ObamaCare law that passed, that rule's got to be published. It's got to go through the administrative procedures course of action.

The President cannot just simply, with impunity and utter arrogance, step up to a podium with the Great Seal of the President of the United States on it and say, now I'm changing things. Hugo Chavez does that. Barack Obama did that. He legislated by press conference.

And now we have more lawlessness coming to undermine the rule of law: grant an amnesty to 11 million people that, if history shows us right, will be 33 million people. If you score that dynamically, you take \$6.3 trillion times 3 and you get better into the zone on what this could cost.

This House is going to stand and oppose amnesty. It's going to defend the rule of law. It's going to protect the dignity of every human person, God's gift to this planet. But this country is also God's gift to this planet.

And I urge, Mr. Speaker, all of those that are listening to this discussion that we're having, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let's stick with our oath of office. Let's stick with our oath to uphold the Constitution. Let's defend the rule of law.

Let's have a smart, legal immigration policy that rewards people that follow the law and can come here and contribute to this country. We cannot be the lifeboat for all of the poverty in the world. But we can be the inspiration for all of God's creatures on this planet.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TODAY

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 10, 2013, at 3 p.m.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Robert B. Aderholt, Rodney Alexander, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Robert E. Andrews, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Ron Barber, Lou Barletta, Garland "Andy" Barr, John Barrow, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Kerry L. Bentivolio, Ami Bera, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Jo Bonner, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Larry Bucshon, Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cardenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Bill Cassidy, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Donna M. Christensen, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins, Doug Collins, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Conolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Tom Cotton, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. "Rick" Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Steve Daines, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Jo Ann Emerson*, Eliot L. Engel, William L. Enyart, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. "Chuck" Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Pete P. Gallego, John Garamendi, Joe Garcia, Cory Gardner, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, Tim Griffin, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Michael G. Grimm, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutierrez, Janice Hahn, Ralph M. Hall, Colleen W. Hanabusa, Richard L. Hanna, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Brian Higgins, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Rush Holt, Michael M. Honda, Steven A. Horsford, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga,

Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Robin L. Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Adam Kinzinger, Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, James Lankford, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Daniel B. Maffei, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Edward J. Markey, Thomas Massie, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Carolyn McCarthy, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Mark Meadows, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, Grace Meng, Luke Messer, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, George Miller, Jeff Miller, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Markwayne Mullin, Mick Mulvaney, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murphy, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Gloria Negrete McLeod, Randy Neugebauer, Kristi L. Noem, Richard M. Nolan, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard B. Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee, Pete Olson, Beto O'Rourke, William L. Owens, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Scott Perry, Gary C. Peters, Scott H. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Robert Pittenger, Joseph R. Pitts, Mark Pocan, Ted Poe, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Mike Quigley, Trey Radel, Nick J. Rahall II, Charles B. Rangel, Tom Reed, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Reid J. Ribble, Tom Rice, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dennis A. Ross, Keith J. Rothfus, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Raul Ruiz, Jon Runyan, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Matt Salmon, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, Mark Sanford, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Bradley S. Schneider, Aaron Schock, Kurt Schrader, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Carol Shea-Porter, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Kyrsten Sinema, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Jason T. Smith, Lamar Smith, Steve Southerland II, Jackie Speier, Chris Stewart, Steve Stivers, Steve Stockman, Marlin A. Stutzman, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takano, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Scott R. Tipton, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, David G.

Valadao, Chris Van Hollen, Juan Vargas, Marc A. Veasey, Filemon Vela, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Ann Wagner, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Jackie Walorski, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Randy K. Weber, Sr., Daniel Webster, Peter Welch, Brad R. Wenstrup, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Roger Williams, Frederica S. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, Ted S. Yoho, C. W. Bill Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1711. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vidalia Onions Grown in Georgia; Change in Reporting and Assessment Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0071; FV13-955-1 IR] received May 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1712. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Program; Section 610 Review [Doc. No.: AMS-LS-07-0143] received May 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1713. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 1 (Scotch) and Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2012-2013 Marketing Year [Doc. Nos.: AMS-FV-11-0088; FV12-958-1A FIR] received May 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1714. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Temporary Suspension of Handling Regulations [Docket No.: AMS-FV-12-0028; FV12-922-2 FIR] received May 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1715. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Mandatory Country of Origin Labeling of Beef, Pork, Lamb, Chicken, Goat Meat, Wild and Farm-Raised Fish and Shellfish, Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Peanuts, Pecans, Ginseng, and Macadamia Nuts [Document No.: AMS-LS-13-0004] (RIN: 0581-AD29) received May 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1716. A letter from the Chairman & President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Norwegian Air Shuttle ASA (Norwegian Air Shuttle) of Fornebu, Norway pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1717. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 253. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of National Forest System land in the Uinta-Wasatch-Cache National Forest in Utah to Brigham Young University, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-98). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1157. A bill to ensure public access to the summit of Rattlesnake Mountain in the Hanford Reach National Monument for educational, recreational, historical, scientific, cultural, and other purposes (Rept. 113-99). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1384. A bill to provide for the issuance of a Wildlife Refuge System Conservation Semipostal Stamp (Rept. 113-100, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1613. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to provide for the proper Federal management and oversight of transboundary hydrocarbon reservoirs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-101, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1613 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. PETRI, Ms. FOX, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 5. A bill to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McKINLEY (for himself and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2272. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish an electronic means by which members of the Ready Reserves of the Armed Forces may track their active-duty service.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan):

H.R. 2273. A bill to implement a program establishing the Great Lakes Navigation

System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 2274. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for a notice-filing registration procedure for brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies and to provide for regulation appropriate to the limited scope of the activities of such brokers; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2275. A bill to treat payments by charitable organizations with respect to certain firefighters as exempt payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 2276. A bill to promote economic development and to preserve the Lake Mead Area in Clark County, Nevada, in order to conserve, protect, and enhance the cultural, archaeological, natural, wilderness, scientific, geological, historical, biological, wildlife, educational, and scenic resources of the area, to designate wilderness areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 2277. A bill to eliminate the sporting purposes distinction in the gun laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOWDY (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COBLE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. LABRADOR):

H.R. 2278. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve immigration law enforcement within the interior of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 2279. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 2280. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a program to provide loans and loan guarantees to enable eligible public entities to acquire interests in real property that are in compliance with habitat conservation plans approved by the Secretary of the Interior under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 2281. A bill to combat cyber espionage of intellectual property of United States persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2282. A bill to regulate Internet gambling, to provide consumer protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2283. A bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking within the Department of State according to congressional intent in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 without increasing the size of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 2284. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to authorize members of the Armed Forces not in uniform and veterans to render a military salute during the recitation of the pledge of allegiance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2285. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance efforts to address antimicrobial resistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 2286. A bill to promote optimal maternity outcomes by making evidence-based maternity care a national priority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 2287. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding Native Hawaiian education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2288. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the exclusion for transportation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 2289. A bill to rename section 219(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as the Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ENYART, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 2290. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to improve energy programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Science, Space, and Technology, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 2291. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 Lexington Avenue in New York, New York, as the "Vincent R. Sombrotto Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2292. A bill to provide for greater regulation of high frequency trading of commodities futures and options and greater protection for derivatives traders and trading facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 2293. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1970 with respect to credit for in-kind contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2294. A bill to remove from the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System certain properties in North Carolina; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 2295. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency to conduct an empirical impact study on proposed rules relating to the International Basel III agreement on general risk-based capital requirements, as they apply to smaller financial institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 2296. A bill to reauthorize the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2297. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to authorize the National Capital Planning Commission to designate and modify the boundaries of the National Mall area in the District of Columbia reserved for the location of commemorative works of pre-eminent historical and lasting significance to the United States and other activities, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to make recommendations for the termination of the authority of a person to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 2298. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to conduct a study on the public health and environmental impacts of the production, transportation, storage, and use of petroleum coke, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. GARCIA):

H.R. 2299. A bill to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury from expanding United States

bank reporting requirements with respect to interest on deposits paid to nonresident aliens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2300. A bill to provide for incentives to encourage health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Rules, Appropriations, the Budget, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 2301. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance the clinical trial registry data bank reporting requirements and enforcement measures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2302. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen and protect Medicare hospice programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 2303. A bill to define the term "covered waste" for purposes of the Department of Defense prohibition on the disposal of certain waste in open-air burn pits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LATTI, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. COBLE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. SCALISE):

H. Res. 250. A resolution expressing support for prayer at school board meetings; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. DENT):

H. Res. 251. A resolution to honor Larry Holmes for his career and community service on the 35th anniversary of his winning the WBC World Heavyweight Title; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LATTI, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. BISHOP of

Utah, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WOLF, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. BRADY of Texas):

H. Res. 252. A resolution calling for free and fair elections in Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENYART:

H. Res. 253. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the night of June 6, 2013, as "National Drive-in Movie Night" to recognize the 80th anniversary of the drive-in movie theatre; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

43. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 130 urging the Congress to support the construction of a memorial commemorating the War in the Pacific at the Pearl Harbor Visitor Center; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

44. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 183 urging the Congress and the President to support and pass the Filipino Veterans Family Reunification Act of 2013 to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from numerical limitations on immigrant visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

45. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3 encouraging the Congress and the President to re-state that the congressional intent of the federal Uniform Controlled Substances Act is not to prohibit the production of industrial hemp; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. RYAN of Ohio introduced a bill (H.R. 2304) for the relief of Amer Numan Adi; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 5.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: the bill is

authorized by Congress' power to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States" pursuant to Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 2273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 2274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 ("The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"), 3 ("To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"), and 18 ("To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof).

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 2276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power to dispose of and legislate for all territories and properties belonging to the United States).

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 2277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which recognizes and protects the right to keep and bear arms.

By Mr. GOWDY:

H.R. 2278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to "establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization." The Supreme Court has long found that this provision of the Constitution grants Congress plenary power over immigration policy. As the Court found in *Galvan v. Press*, 347 U.S. 522, 531 (1954) "that the formulation of policies [pertaining to the entry of aliens and the right to remain here] is entrusted to Congress has become about as firmly imbedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government."

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 2279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 2280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 aid clause 18.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 2281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18, as this bill better equips the Executive Branch to properly carry out the powers vested in it by the Constitution, as well as ensures that Congress is accurately informed of a foreign nations' trafficking record and tier ranking when Congress considers regulation of commerce with foreign nations.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 2284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 16

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article X, Section Y, Clause Z

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 2287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 2288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article 1

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 2293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 2294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 2295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several States.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 2296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clauses 14 and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan:

H.R. 2298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 2299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Amendment XVI of the Constitution of the United States:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 2300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the original understanding of the commerce clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found in Clause 3 of Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution.

The bill repeals the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which exceeds the authority vested in Congress by the Constitution.

Finally, the bill removed government intrusion into the doctor-patient relationship, which is protected by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: to provide for the common defense and general welfare.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: to provide for the common defense and general welfare.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 2303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. PETERS of California.
 H.R. 131: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 164: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 182: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 198: Mr. CLAY, Ms. HAHN, Ms. BASS, and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 272: Mr. PIERLUISI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. McKEON, Mr. COOK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. BASS, and Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 274: Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 352: Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 362: Mr. CLYBURN and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 363: Mr. CLYBURN and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 367: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. DUFFY.
 H.R. 460: Mr. ENYART and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 494: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 508: Ms. MENG, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 523: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 525: Ms. GABBARD.
 H.R. 543: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. VELA, and Mr. ROONEY.
 H.R. 597: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 601: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 647: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 654: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 698: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 702: Mr. TONKO and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 713: Mr. FARR, Mr. WALZ, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio,

Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 719: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 721: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BARR, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 728: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 755: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 763: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 797: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 805: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 842: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 847: Ms. SPEIER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 850: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 863: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 901: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 940: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 942: Mr. NEAL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 948: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 958: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 961: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1009: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1015: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1020: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 1024: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 1037: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1077: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1098: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1150: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1155: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1180: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 1186: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1199: Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 1201: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 1250: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1255: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1303: Mr. BENISHEK and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 1337: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1339: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1354: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1389: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1414: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1438: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1449: Mr. LATTI and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1451: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1480: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1484: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1494: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1527: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1551: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1552: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1565: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1613: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 1688: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1727: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1733: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1751: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 1756: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 1771: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. COLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 1790: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1795: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1797: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1809: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1814: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1823: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1825: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 1830: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1838: Mr. GRIMM, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1844: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1861: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1864: Mr. COOK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. TITUS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESTY, Mr. ENYART, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BERA of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1869: Mr. GARRETT, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KIND, Mr. RADEL, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1870: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1874: Mr. HURT.

H.R. 1878: Mr. OWENS and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 1891: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1897: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1904: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1920: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1936: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1965: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1971: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1998: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1999: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 2000: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2002: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2009: Mr. NUNNELEE and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2011: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 2016: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2019: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 2022: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2026: Mr. HANNA, Mr. HURT, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2028: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 2030: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2068: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 2072: Mr. YOHIO.

H.R. 2084: Mr. BARBER and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 2093: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 2119: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2138: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2141: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 2166: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2170: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2173: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 2175: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. YODER, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 2182: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2202: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 2231: Mr. DAINES, Mr. STEWARD, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 2250: Mr. KILMER.

H.J. Res. 28: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COLE, Mr. STEWART,

Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BARR, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. YOHIO.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. DUFFY.

H. Res. 35: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WOODALL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BARTON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. LATTA.

H. Res. 135: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Res. 136: Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Res. 160: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H. Res. 236: Mr. VARGAS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1249: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.J. Res. 43: Mr. BUCHANAN.